

The Hispanic American Historical Review

Vol. V

AUGUST, 1922

No. 3

Anglo-Spanish Relations in America in the Closing Years of the Colonial Era

By
VERA LEE BROWN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Preface.....	329-332
Introduction.....	333-336
Chapter I. Spain in America, 1763-1770.....	337-350
Situation after the Peace of Paris.....	337
Reform in Mexico.....	338
Extension of plans of reform to other parts of Spanish America.....	342
Transfer of Louisiana from French to Spanish rule 1763-1769.....	344
Chapter II. Anglo-Spanish Relations in America, 1763-1770.....	351-386
General character of the relations of the two Powers in America.....	351
The sovereignty of the Mosquito Coast.....	351
The logwood cutters of the Bay of Honduras and their rights under the Treaty of Paris.....	358
West Florida and Louisiana.....	369
General O'Reilly and the British right to navigate the Mississippi.....	369
The Island Inhabitants of Spain and Great Britain in America with special reference to their disputes over deserting slaves.....	372
British contraband trade in America.....	374
Spanish treatment of British subjects taken prisoners in America.....	382
Conclusion.....	385
Chapter III. The Falkland Islands.....	387-447
Discovery of the Island group.....	387
Admiral Anson's <i>Voyage Round the World in the years 1740-1744</i> and subsequent British project of settlement in 1750.....	390
Byron at the Falklands, 1765.....	394
Captain John McBride of the <i>Jason</i>	397
Discovery of the French settlement and the British protest against its presence.....	401
Cession of the French settlement to Spain.....	403
Captain Hunt's encounter with the Spaniards in November, 1769.....	403
Seizure of Port Egmont by order of the Spanish Governor of Buenos Ayres in June, 1770.....	407
British demand that Spain disavow the expedition against Port Egmont and restore affairs to the state in which they had previously been.....	408
Review of Anglo-Spanish relations since 1766.....	411
Course of the diplomatic controversy and the influence of France on Spanish counsels.....	412
Withdrawal of the English representative from Madrid.....	436
Masserano's declaration.....	438
Harris's reception on his return to Madrid.....	441

Disarmament.....	444
Formal restitution of Port Egmont to the English.....	445
Abandonment of the Islands by England in 1774.....	445
Chapter IV. Anglo-Spanish Relations in America, 1771-1774.....	448-473
Result of the Falkland Island incident on the relations of England and Spain, and the close connection of events in Europe and America throughout the period under discussion.....	448
British warships and their relation to contraband trade in Old Spain....	449
American phase of the same issue; the incident of the <i>Sir Edward Hawke</i>	451
The right of search as applicable to English trading vessels in America; the incident of the New York trading sloop <i>Hawke</i>	459
The absorption of Spain in domestic affairs through the greater part of 1772, and, in consequence, a year of unusual quiet in America.....	463
England's interest in Spain's attitude toward contemporary European events throughout 1772 and 1773; the partition of Poland, the Swedish revolution.....	464
Growing warmth in the relations of France and Spain as the Triple Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia becomes more menacing.....	465
The Toulon fleet and Spanish preparations at Cartagena lead to the arming of a British fleet.....	467
Orders for the arming of the extraordinary fleets declared countermanded	467
Spanish military activity continued throughout 1773.....	468
American incidents during 1773—few in number.....	469
Crab Island incident.....	469
Future outlook for Anglo-Spanish relations in June, 1774.....	473
Conclusion.....	474-479
Bibliography.....	479-483
Primary Sources	
A. Manuscript.....	479
B. Printed.....	480
Secondary Works.....	482

PREFACE

The following study is for the most part based upon an investigation of the records of the relations between England and Spain from 1763 to 1779 which are preserved in the British Museum and the Public Records Office in London. This period is the interval between the close of the Seven Years' War and Spain's entrance into the American war in June, 1779. In the present monograph the relations of the two powers are discussed only in so far as their American interests are concerned, and only to the year 1774, at which date the issue of the American war becomes the principal factor in the relations of England with the Bourbon powers.

The materials for such a study are now fairly comprehensive. They have received large additions since the appearance, in 1813, of Archdeacon Coxe's classic *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon*, by the publication of numerous documents drawn from the archives of France and Spain, and the printing of letters, memoirs, and other writings which throw light on the personalities of the time. Numerous letters which passed between Charles III. and Louis XV., or between the Duc de Choiseul and the Marquis Grimaldi, the chief ministers of France and Spain in the years preceding 1770, or were written by these ministers to the French and Spanish representatives in Paris, Madrid, and London are to be found in such works as J. Flammermont's *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements* (Paris, 1874) and L. Blart's *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne après la Pacte de Famille jusqu'à la Fin du Ministère du Duc de Choiseul* (Paris, 1915). These letters, which are, of course, of the first importance for an understanding of the diplomatic history of the period, have been extensively used in the preparation of this study. They are especially full and valuable through the period of the Falklands Islands crisis. The publication of such collections of documents as the *Correspondance Secrète entre Marie-*

Thérèse et le Comte de Mercy-Argenteau (Paris, 1874), the companion work of the *Correspondance Secrète du Comte de Mercy-Argenteau avec l'Empereur Joseph II et le Prince de Kaunitz* (Paris, 1889-1891), the *Correspondance Secrète et autres Documents de Louis XV* (Paris, 1866), and the *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs de la France depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution française* (Paris, 1886, etc.) have added greatly to our knowledge of the diplomatic history of the period. Of greater interest in a study of the European relations of England and Spain than in connection with the colonial history of these powers, they have been utilized to some extent in the preparation of the present work. Of other memoirs and letters published in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the following may be mentioned as of special interest for the subject in hand: *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris, First Earl of Malmesbury* (London, 1844), *A Series of Letters of the First Earl of Malmesbury* (London, 1870), *Mémoires de Choiseul-Stainville* (Paris, 1904), *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne; afterwards First Marquis of Lansdowne with Extracts from his Papers*, by E. G. P. Fitzmaurice (London, 1875), and the *Correspondence of George III with Lord North, 1867*. Henri Doniol's monumental work, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique* (Paris, 1886-1899), begins with the year 1774 and, therefore, its great treasure of documents does not bear on the present subject.

Another class of documents, indispensable for such a study as the present one, consists of the journals and accounts of voyages of discovery and exploration belonging to the period in question. As the greater part of these were published in the eighteenth century they have long been well known. Reference to them will be found in the appended alphabetical list of printed sources and quotations from them in the notes to the text.

While printed materials fill an important place in a study of the colonial relations of England and Spain in the years succeeding the peace of Paris, the bulk of information must be drawn from manuscript sources. Of these the State Papers relating to Spain which are preserved in the Public Records Office and con-

sist of the correspondence between the British government and its representatives in Spain is the largest single source of information. Among the most important of these Spanish State Papers for the subject in hand, and one hitherto made small use of, as far as I have been able to discover, are a set marked "State Papers, Foreign, Spain, supplementary". These documents, which will be found extensively quoted in the text, bear particularly on the little known history of the Falkland Islands settlements in the period falling between Byron's visit in 1765 and the forced evacuation of Port Egmont by the British in 1770. Because of the close connection of Spain with France throughout the period, the State Papers relating to France are almost indispensable, while those bearing on Austrian affairs (S. P. Foreign, Germany (Empire)) throw valuable side-lights on various aspects of the main subject.

The Grantham Papers, included among the Additional MSS. in the British Museum, contain the original letters addressed by the home government and by ministers at other European courts to Lord Grantham, the British ambassador to Spain 1771-1779, and copies of his letters in reply. Besides these papers I could find little else among the manuscripts at the British Museum of great value for the subject of the present thesis.

The Colonial Office Papers, especially the series on "British Honduras" and "America and the West Indies", and the Admiralty Papers relating to the Jamaica station have provided the greater part of the information about the relations of England and Spain on the Mosquito Coast and in Honduras Bay as well as much of the information bearing on the matter of English contraband trade on the Spanish Main. The Colonial Office Papers and the Spanish State Papers have furnished the largest section of the information in regard to the relations of the two powers on the Mississippi boundary. The material, bearing on the transfer of Louisiana from the French to the Spanish crown, has been drawn chiefly from a copy of the correspondence between the French government and its officials in Louisiana in the years from 1763-1769, which was made from originals in *Les Archives Nationales* of France for the Canadian

Archives and kindly loaned to me by Mr. Biggar, the representative of the Canadian Archives in Europe. These documents are referred to in the notes as "A. N. Colonie F 3/25". A collection of Spanish documents, entitled "Documentos Históricos de la Florida y la Luisiana, siglos XVI al XVIII", which was published in Madrid in 1913, has also been extensively used.

The secondary materials of the period under review consist of biographies of Charles III. and of other important contemporary personages, of studies of separate phases of Spanish or English colonial activity, of general works on British or Spanish colonial policy, of studies of the contemporary relations between France and Spain, and of a few short review articles which cover in a cursory fashion the political relations of England and Spain through an extended period. No investigator, so far as I have been able to discover, has hitherto made his primary line of investigation the field of the present study.

The subject as a fruitful field of research was suggested by Professor Firth of the University of Oxford. In the course of preparation Professor A. P. Newton of King's college, University of London, assisted me very greatly with valuable advice both in regard to source material and form of presentation. I have also to express my appreciation of assistance afforded me in various ways by Professor Howard Gray of Bryn Mawr College, by Professor C. H. Haring of Yale University, by Mr. Hubert Hall of the Public Records Office, and by Mr. H. P. Biggar, the representative of the Canadian Archives in Europe.

V. L. B.

Bryn Mawr College, March, 1922.

ANGLO-SPANISH RELATIONS IN AMERICA IN THE CLOSING YEARS OF THE COLONIAL ERA

INTRODUCTION

The heroic character of the struggle between England and France in the eighteenth century with its dramatic consequences for the future development of the Anglo-Saxon peoples has tended to dwarf the importance of the parallel conflict carried on in the same century between England and Spain. Covering a period which stretched from the death, in 1702, of the last Spanish Hapsburg ruler to the loss of the Spanish colonial possessions on the continent of America at the close of the first quarter of the last century, the conflict accounts for much of the history of the eighteenth century and provides a clue to not a little of that of the nineteenth.

Of the two countries Spain was the older colonial power. Her great burst of colonizing energy had its fullest expression in the sixteenth century, and since Philip II.'s time there had been little advance. But at the beginning of the eighteenth century, if it was France whom England regarded as the arch enemy, this arose fully as much from that nation's might as a continental power as from the greatness of her colonial possessions; for these latter were formidable rather in their possibilities of development in the hands of a determined and energetic nation ambitious for world power than in their actual extent. It was not France but Spain who in expanse of colonial territory at the beginning of the century of war bestrode the world like a colossus. That the colonial issue was of secondary interest in the wars between England and Spain which followed the Peace of Utrecht was due to the fact that the new energy which the Bourbons carried with them to Spain chiefly spent itself under Philip V., not in the colonial field, but in European projects. In the intrigues, which

had for their chief result the establishment of two Spanish princes in Italian principalities where they faced rulers devoted to the Austrian interest, national ambitions to regain what had been lost in the first war of the century were frequently lost sight of and remained unrealised. But if Philip V., in the multiplicity of his European interests, tended to overlook the importance of his colonial dominions, England bore them more steadily in mind. It was Philip, the son of the House of Bourbon who had come into control of Spanish world power, with whom she went to war repeatedly in the first half of the eighteenth century. Ferdinand VI. inherited an empty treasury and an exhausted kingdom in 1746. By adopting a policy of strict neutrality and non-intervention abroad he succeeded in giving to the country a breathing time in which to recover from its accumulated miseries and left to his successor that rarest of all Spanish royal inheritances, a surplus in the treasury.

Charles III. became king of Spain in 1759. Brought up abroad and hitherto associated with Spain only in her aspect as a world power, Charles had the outlook and the means to adopt a wider policy than his predecessors. On his accession he found a war raging between the other two great colonial powers of the world, whose issue, the mastership of the North American continent, could not but affect his own American dominions. Inheriting traditions of hostility to England from his French father and having to remember English support to Austrian arms in Italy where Spanish ambitions had succeeded largely through French support, he believed that there was no reasonable doubt that French success would injure his interests least. To help forward the result which he desired he signed the Family Compact in August, 1761, and in the following spring joined the Seven Years' War against England. This step not only failed to avert the complete defeat of France but brought heavy loss of prestige and provinces to Spain herself and left her in a far from favorable position to meet the situation when she alone divided with England colonial power in North America. After the Treaty of Paris, Spain faced England with her military weakness known, her coffers empty, and, through her acceptance of France's

remaining American continental possession of Louisiana, her own forced cession of Florida to Great Britain, and the concession of badly defined rights to the British logwood cutters of Honduras, in a more dangerous position in relation to the English power than she had ever hitherto held. Her closely pressed monopolistic theory of colonial commerce closed three-quarters of the New World to a nation of traders who now ruled the seas; on the Mississippi she stood fairly across the path of English advance overland to the Pacific while her vague claims in the South Atlantic, based on the Papal Bull of Alexander VI., were not likely to make her way easier in an epoch to be memorable for the interest of all maritime nations in the exploration of the South Seas.

In contrast to the Spanish power with its colonial impulse a hundred and fifty years behind it, weakened by an ambitious European policy and despotic wars, and possessed abroad of more lands than its people could settle or command, stood the English power now at the height of its colonizing activities. Rich in experience, in the full flush of confidence in her military power as the result of a marvelous series of successful wars, and wealthy from a commerce grown to very considerable proportions, Spain's chief rival in the colonial field was within a few years to prove herself able to face a war with her own colonists and in the struggle to lose an empire and yet find energy to discover and plant another as great as the one given up.

To the student of to-day, the future of Anglo-Spanish relations in 1763 appears to have worn an inevitably hostile aspect, but English statesmen on the morrow of the Treaty of Paris, while not doubting that France would take the first opportunity to avenge her downfall as a colonial power and carry her ally with her if she could, reopened diplomatic relations with Spain in a spirit of real hope that that nation could be induced to return to her friendly policy of the seventeenth century. They argued that the Family Compact by which her Bourbon sovereign had bound her to France was but two years old, that it was not yet sanctioned by age or tradition, and that it clearly had already plunged the country into a disastrous war in which the material losses involved in the forced cession of the frontier province of

Florida, the surrender of treasured fishing claims in Newfoundland, and the enforced concessions to the hated British logwood cutters in Honduras, were realised by the Spanish people themselves to be only a small penalty for the loss of national prestige incurred in the disgraceful failure of the Portuguese campaign and the capitulation of Havana and Manila. It was thought that these disasters which had followed hard upon the French alliance, the traditional friendly attitude of the Spanish people towards England, and their general hatred and jealousy of the French furnished legitimate grounds for the hope that the Spanish Government might be persuaded to return to a policy which had been considered to be in the national interests in the days before a Frenchman became king of Spain. This British desire for peace with Spain had a basis in commercial interest which was entirely absent from the relationship between France and England. Essentially an agricultural country which failed to produce sufficient manufactured products to supply the needs of the peninsula, yet called upon to furnish a huge dependent empire with that very class of supplies, Spain, since the time of James I., had offered an outlet for the products of English workshops and looms which constituted a standing argument against the interruption of amicable relations between the two peoples. Anglo-Spanish relations in the period which opened with the Peace of Paris were to be modified, as they had long been, by the English wish to find a middle path by which, while narrowing Spanish holdings, monopolies, and pretensions in the New World, Great Britain might retain the profitable market which long years of effort had built up in Old Spain. Of the two fairly distinct categories into which the relations of the two powers fall—the one comprising their European interests, the other their colonial activities—it is of the American phase of the latter that the present monograph treats.

CHAPTER I

SPAIN IN AMERICA

In America the Seven Years' War created an entirely new outlook for Spain as a colonial power. The terms on which the conflict closed left that country the sole rival on the North American continent of the victorious English nation. The acceptance of the cession of Louisiana from France meant the disappearance of a friendly buffer state behind whose protecting wall the rich Mexican kingdom had hitherto developed practically untroubled. In the future her rulers must face the problems involved in an international boundary with an ambitious, restless, and recently hostile state. To add to the difficulties Great Britain shared with Spain the right to navigate the Mississippi, which had now become the boundary river, while the cession of West Florida installed England as a power in the Gulf of Mexico where the two ports of Pensacola and Mobile might be expected to develop into convenient headquarters for a flourishing contraband trade to all the Spanish territories facing on the Gulf. In Central America the victor had compelled the recognition of the legality of the presence of the British logwood cutters in Honduras Bay. On the seas which rolled between the Spanish Indies and the homeland the English navy was indisputably supreme. The dangers which Charles III. had feared in 1759 had in fact already partly translated themselves into realities. Spanish colonial possessions had indeed begun to follow the way of the French. The chief difference in the situation lay in the fact that in 1759 the strength of the great Spanish colonial fortresses was still a matter of speculation, while in 1763 their weakness was an open secret to the enemy, English soldiers having actually been in possession of the two most renowned.¹ Plainly, if Spain like

¹ Manila was captured by an English force under Vice-Admiral Sir Samuel Cornish and Lieutenant-General Sir William Draper in 1762. In the same year Havana fell also to a British force under Admiral Sir George Pocock and the Earl of Albemarle.

France was not to be driven from the colonial field as a first-class power, such an effort in strengthening colonial forces as had never been hitherto dreamed of must be made. It was therefore no surprise when within a few months of the Earl of Rochford's² arrival in Spain as the first British ambassador after the peace that the British government was made aware that the defense of the Indies had become the first matter of concern to the Spanish state.

Mexico was the first of the Spanish overseas provinces to receive attention. During February and March of 1764, the British ambassador reported that, with a view to reinforcing the government of Mexico, the Marquis de Villalba had been appointed commander-in-chief and was to proceed overseas at once, accompanied by four majors-general, four brigadiers, four colonels, and a force of two thousand men. There was also, the ambassador added, a rumor abroad that a Mexican militia of twenty thousand men was to be set on foot. He gathered from these facts that the view was to establish in Mexico a military government and "rule as absolutely in New Spain as in Old".³ He had, however, been assured by Marquis Squillace, the friendly minister of finance,⁴ that these new arrangements should cause the British

² William Henry Zuytlestein, fourth Earl of Rochford (1717-1781). Born at St. Osyth Priory, Essex, his first diplomatic appointment was that of envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the king of Sardinia, which he held from 1749-1755. In 1755 he was appointed first lord of the bedchamber and was sworn a member of the privy council. From 1763-1766 he was British ambassador at the court of Spain and moved from this post to the embassy at Paris. On October 21, 1768, he was made secretary of state for the Northern Department and relinquished this office on December 19, 1770, to replace Lord Weymouth as secretary of state for the Southern Department. He resigned this appointment in October, 1775. His death occurred at St. Osyth in 1781.

³ S. P. Spain 166. Rochford to Halifax, 13 February and 12 March, 1764.

⁴ Don Leopoldo de Gregorio, Marquis de Squillace, had accompanied Charles from Naples to Spain in 1759 and been placed by him at the head of the departments of finance (1759) and war (1763). Realizing the hopelessness of ever detaching the Marquis Grimaldi, Charles' foreign minister, from his partiality for the French, Rochford in the early part of his ministry hoped to check the torrent of French influence through Squillace through whose hands all commercial affairs had to pass. Before many months were passed, however, the ambassador wrote that Squillace was planning to wind up his affairs and retire to Sicily, and consequently was most anxious to pursue pacific measures. While continuing

ministry no alarm since they were merely designed to secure the country better service than was rendered by the corrupt *corregidores* who had hitherto governed the province.

This first attempt after the peace to improve the administration and defense of one of the Spanish colonies was not crowned with success. On Villalba's arrival in Mexico, the powers of the new commander-in-chief were considered by the viceroy an infringement of his privileges, and dissension became the order of the day. The disturbances took on serious proportions when Villalba as head of the military forces deprived the viceroy of his guards and the head of the civil government retaliated by refusing to issue money, and thus caused rioting and pillaging on the part of the unpaid troops.⁵ Finally, after a year of disorder, in July, 1765, both the viceroy and the commander-in-chief were temporarily suspended from their offices,⁶ and in the following month Don José de Gálvez arrived in Mexico holding the office of *visitador* and charged with instructions to put into effect a new administrative scheme which had been recently adopted by the Spanish government.

The author of the new plan was one Carrasco described by

to keep on good terms with the English ambassador and seldom refusing any favor asked, he gave, through the last eighteen months of his administration, a general acquiescence to Grimaldi's policy. He was finally forced to flee from the country by a riot of 1766, organized, it was widely believed, by the French for the purpose of ridding the Spanish government of one so notoriously anti-French in sympathy.

⁵ S. P. Spain 170. De Visme to Halifax, 25 April and 6 May, 1765. "Though a great silence has been observed at this court concerning the affairs of Mexico, yet there is no reason to doubt that the differences between M. de Villalba and the Viceroy have very bad consequences; as the former brought with him orders to command all the military, he deprived the latter of his guards, who in his turn would issue out no more money; the troops unpaid were guilty of many excesses; they pillaged several houses, and then retired to the mountains where they were kindly received by the inhabitants, who allow them very considerable pay. The discontent caused by the new system, and by the introduction of the military, after the manner of the Spaniards is very general throughout the country; in order to bring them to reason a very warm press has been carried on of late all over Andalusia . . . to recruit their troops in New Spain and in the Havana. . . . By all I can find the new system will not be laid aside but only undergo several changes. . . ."

⁶ S. P. Spain 171. Rochford to Halifax, 8 July, 1765.

Rochford as "a man of great abilities and intrigue".⁷ The object of his scheme was to increase the revenue which Spain drew from America, a first step, as Spain's own coffers were empty, toward the realization of any extensive plans of improving the state of colonial defense. Asserting that the whole revenue from the Spanish Indies did not exceed twenty millions of French livres, of which not more than eight millions came clear to the king, Carrasco declared that Charles was most shamefully defrauded. Mexico alone, he maintained, was quite able, if properly administered, to provide an increase to the revenue of fifty millions of French livres. The whole trade of the country, he observed, was in the hands of four bodies—the royal *audiencia*, the magistracy, the military, and the secular priests—perpetually at war with one another. He proposed that the person to whom the king entrusted the execution of the plan should gain by intrigue two of these bodies, and crush the other two, and restore a more centralised form of control. As the scheme promised an increase in revenue without any outlay it was received with favor and, on the recommendation of Carrasco, Don José de Gálvez, a lawyer by profession, was despatched to Vera Cruz to put it into execution. Officially the new agent merely bore instructions to inspect as *visitador general* the *praesidios* of New Spain.

On his arrival in the New World, Gálvez found it advisable to suspend the execution of the elaborate orders he carried and deal as existing circumstances suggested with the situation. As a first step he succeeded in reconciling the viceroy and the commander-in-chief and persuading the city of Mexico to offer the king a free gift of two hundred thousand crowns with the promise that similar gifts should be made in the future. For six years Gálvez remained in New Spain, instilling reform and vigor into every branch of the administration. During this period, he, rather than the viceroy, the Marquis de Cruilles, and later the Marquis de Croix, was the real ruler of Mexico. Through the first three years of his visit he gave his chief attention to reforming the financial administration of the central provinces, but

⁷ S. P. Spain 173. Rochford to Conway, 12 March, 1766.

after 1768 he devoted himself primarily to enforcing peace on the hostile border Indians and pushing forward the line of Spain's advance towards the western coast where the eventual occupation of Alta California was due to his efforts.⁸

The interest shown by Gálvez in the work of discovering and appropriating new lands formed part of a general movement. On the close of the Seven Years' War the maritime nations of western Europe took up with renewed energy the assault upon the unknown portions of the earth which hostilities between them had interrupted. The Pacific became the favorite field of enterprise. France and England, as well as Spain, despatched, during the sixties, expeditions to the southern Pacific, while from the north the Russian fur traders worked their way slowly southward along the shores of the Bering Sea. Rumors of foreign interest in the Californias were rife when Gálvez left Spain, although the imminence of the peril from English expeditions actually in the Pacific during the sixties does not appear to have been fully grasped until his return. A general and lively fear prevailed, however, from the Peace of Paris onwards, that the English, now in possession of Canada, would not stop their overland advance east of the Lake of the Woods from which a river was said to flow westward, whose waters, it was thought, might bear members of that enterprising nation to Mexico.⁹ These considerations, while not entirely responsible for Gálvez's Mexican policy of extension westward, undoubtedly strengthened his determination to establish a recognized Spanish claim to as much of the Pacific coast region as possible.

On Gálvez's return to Spain in 1771, the policy which he had so ably set on foot was carried forward by the exceptionally capable viceroy, Don Antonio Maria Bucarely y Ursula, who remained in charge of Mexican affairs from 1771 to 1779. The rich discoveries of gold at Cieneguilla and elsewhere in Mexico at the very commencement of Bucarely's administration enabled

⁸ Cf. Chapman, C. E., *The Founding of Spanish California*, New York, 1916, Ch. VI; and Bolton and Marshall, *The Colonization of North America*, New York, 1920, Ch. XXI.

⁹ Chapman, C. E., *The Founding of Spanish California*, Ch. IV, VIII, and X.

the province to support the ambitious program which Gálvez had drawn up, which his successor approved, and which clearer reports of English and Russian activities in the far west seemed to make more urgent. On the death, in 1776, of the Bailly Arriaga, the minister of the Indies¹⁰ under whose encouragement and support the earlier improvements had gone forward, Gálvez became the minister of the Indies.¹¹ Looked as a whole, the interval between the Peace of Paris and Spain's entrance into the American War in 1779 was for Mexico a period of exceptional prosperity, good administration, and territorial advancement under the leadership of exceptionally able men.

In other parts of Spanish America the efforts of the home government to reform the financial administration and strengthen the colonial forces met with the same opposition that they encountered in the first instance in Mexico.¹² The years 1765

¹⁰ Don Julián de Arriaga was reported by the Earl of Rochford, shortly after that ambassador's arrival in Spain in 1763, to be among the three most influential ministers in the Spanish government. While not consulted outside of his own departments, these, the marine and the Indies, were very important and touched English interests at every point. Rochford described Arriaga as "well-meaning but led entirely by the Jesuits" (S. P. Spain 166, Rochford to Halifax, most secret, 13 Jan., 1764). Eight years later Lord Grantham, the British ambassador of that time, wrote that the Bailly's infirmities and foibles "were not of a nature to diminish under a growing weight of years and that he would probably be soon reduced to merely signing the orders which he might receive", although he still possessed the king's confidence (Add. MSS 24174, Grantham to Rochford, Dec. 16, 1772). The retention by Charles III. in high office of Arriaga, usually, as above, considered as a typical indolent Spanish minister devoted to beaten paths (cf. Rousseau, F., *Règne de Charles III d'Espagne*, Paris, 1907, I. p. 18) has usually been explained on the ground of Charles' hatred of change and faithfulness to old servants. Professor Chapman, however, in his volume on *The Founding of Spanish California* has made it clear that his study of the colonial records of the time has inspired him with admiration for what this minister of Charles accomplished. He points out that a brilliant period of Spanish colonial history closed with Arriaga's death. In 1776, Arriaga was succeeded in office by two Spaniards; as minister of the Indies by Don José Gálvez and in the department of marine by Don Pedro González de Castijón.

¹¹ Gálvez received this appointment on 31 January, 1776. In August, 1785, he was created Marquis de Sonora. He died in 1787. Cf. *Recueil Espagne*, III. 335.

¹² S. P. Spain 173. Rochford to Conway, 12 March, 1766.

Ibid., 174. De Visme to Richmond, 30 January, 1766.

Ibid., 176. De Visme to Shelburne, 23 February, 1767.

Ibid., 176. De Visme to Shelburne, 28 February, 1767.

Ibid., 176. De Visme to Shelburne, 16 March, 1767.

and 1766 were, from this cause, very disturbed ones throughout the whole of Spain's overseas dominions. The most serious of the insurrections occurred at Quito, Panama, and Havana. As far as possible the Spanish government endeavored to prevent the true state of affairs from becoming known, and intercepted all circumstantial letters from the seats of disturbance. Lord Rochford wrote from Madrid in March, 1766, that it was "most difficult to get intelligence that might be depended upon".¹³ Secrecy, however, implied no looking back from the course determined on. The ablest men in the government gave their first attention to drawing up new regulations for the Indies,¹⁴ the best officers in the Spanish service were sent to put them into execution, and troops were despatched in large numbers to support each new governor in this task.¹⁵ By the close of 1766, reforms were in progress over a wide area, order was restored, and the Spanish colonial possessions were presided over by a group of men of more distinguished ability than had been in the New World capitals for many a day.¹⁶ Future events were to prove that in relation to foreign powers the very abilities of the new colonial governors constituted a serious danger to the state. The vigor that was required to improve internal conditions when applied to the interpretation of instructions touching relations with foreign states, repeatedly led the Spanish government into

¹³ *Ibid.*, 173. Rochford to Conway, 12 March, 1766.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 167. Rochford to Halifax, Aranjuez, 7 May, 1764. "Since our arrival here where the Spanish ministers have more time to attend to external affairs than they have at Madrid their whole attention seems to be taken up with making new regulations for the West Indies as well as for the trade of this country.

¹⁵ S. P. Spain 166. Rochford to Halifax, 12 March, 1764.

Ibid., 173. Rochford to Conway, 12 March, 1766.

Ibid., 177. De Visme to Shelburne, June, 1767.

Ibid., 178. De Visme to Shelburne, 20 July, 1767.

Ibid., 179. Gray to Shelburne, 4 February, 1768.

¹⁶ S. P. Spain 172. Rochford to Conway, 11 November, 1765. Referring to the appointments of Don Francisco Bucareli to the head of the government at Buenos Aires of Don Antonio Bucareli to Havana, Maldonado to Porto Rico, and Don Antonio Manso to Santa Fé, Rochford remarks: "All I have to observe upon this is that they are sending the very ablest officers they have to that part of the world."

controversies from which there proved to be no exit except through total retreat.

At the close of 1766, the only Spanish province which had not found its place in the rigorous new order of things and attained to a certain degree of settled tranquillity was the recently acquired territory of Louisiana. The treaty which transferred to Spain the possessions of France on the west bank of the Mississippi, together with the island and town of New Orleans, was ratified at Madrid on November 13, 1762.¹⁷ For some time Spain, burdened with other matters, made no attempt to take formal possession of the new land or interfere in any way with the system of government installed there. The gift which seemed to the British ambassador so unbelievably generous¹⁸ that he found it difficult to persuade himself that France had no ulterior motive of securing something more valuable as compensation, was received by the Spanish government absolutely without enthusiasm.¹⁹ The "old Spaniard" plainly called the transaction an ingenious device on the part of France to rid itself of a heavy encumbrance, while in council the opinion was seriously advanced that the most advantageous use to which the new possession could be put was to make a

¹⁷ *Documentos Históricos de . . . Luisiana*, Madrid, 1913. Carta de D. Ricardo Wall al Marques de Grimaldi. El Escorial, 13 Nov. de 1762.

¹⁸ S. P. Spain 172. Rochford to Conway, 4 November, 1765. "It has been with great difficulty that this court has been prevailed on to accept of it [Louisiana]. . . . The extraordinary generosity on the part of the French court and the uncommon backwardness in this in accepting the offer is a little uncommon, but I can take upon me to assure you it has nothing mysterious in it".

¹⁹ S. P. Spain 170. Rochford to Halifax, 11 March, 1765. "I have always suspected that the French by the cession of Louisiana had something farther in view than increasing their credit in Spain by a mere act of generosity . . . but after the most mature examination (and I have taken great pains to find out the truth) I cannot believe this court has or will yield anything to the French in compensation for Louisiana".

Documentos Históricos de . . . la Luisiana, Madrid, 1913. A letter from the Duc de Choiseul to the Marquis Grimaldi, dated Versailles, Nov. 3, 1762, is in the following terms: . . . Sa Majesté très Chrétienne, véritablement sensible aux sacrifices que le Roy Catholique a bien voulu faire généreusement, pour concourir avec elle au rétablissement de la Paix, a désiré de luy donner à cette occasion une preuve du vif intérêt qu'elle prend à sa satisfaction et aux avantages de sa couronne".

desert of it, and by so doing place a no-man's land between the British and Spanish settlements.²⁰

In the spring of 1764, the French government, understanding that immediate arrangements were to be made by Spain to take formal possession of Louisiana, despatched to its officials at New Orleans the necessary directions for the orderly transfer of the sovereignty,²¹ and ordered a French officer from Louisiana to present himself at Madrid to receive in person the Catholic king's command concerning his new territory.²² By the close of September, at the latest, it was confidently expected that the French officials would be on their way home. When, however, more than a year had passed and Spain had taken no action, a somewhat peremptory letter was despatched from Versailles to the French ambassador in Madrid setting forth the extreme perplexity and embarrassment in which the French administrators of Louisiana were placed through Spain's hesitation and long delay.²³

But despite the prompting of the Marquis d'Ossun many months passed before the new Spanish governor, Don Antonio de Ulloa,²⁴ sailed from Havana for his new post. Finally on

²⁰ S. P. Spain 170. Rochford to Halifax, 11 March, 1765. "All the Old Spaniards look upon the cession of Louisiana as a disadvantage to this nation [Spain] and as a proof the greatest part of them are of this opinion, it is totally neglected. To my certain knowledge it has been proposed in council to make a desert of it,—the reason, indeed, given for this was that it would put our settlements at a still greater distance from Mexico".

²¹ A. N. Colonie, F 3/25, fol. 31—. Le Ministre a M. d'Abbadie, 13 May, 1764, and fol. 32, D'Abbadie au Ministre, 30 Sept., 1764.

²² S. P. Spain 166. Rochford to Halifax, 30 April, 1764.

²³ A. N. Colonie F 3/25, fol. 34. Le Ministre à M. D'Ossun, 31 July, 1765; and S. P. Spain 172, Rochford to Conway, 4 Nov., 1765. "M. Grimaldi informed me that M. de Choiseul was even peevish at their neglect". Complaints on this score had begun as early as Dec., 1763. Cf. Carta de D. Fernando Majallón al Marqués de Grimaldi, Paris, 23 décembre de 1763. "Señor: Hablando un conversacion sobre la Luisiana con el Duque de Choiseul, me dixo que le escribía el Marqués d'Ossun tardariamos aun un año en entregarnos de aquella Colonia, me añadió inmediatamente, con cierta especie de sentimiento, que no sabía en que consistía esta lentitud, y que a la verdad le servia de grande embarazo". *Documentos Históricos de . . . la Luisiana en siglos XVI al XVIII*, Madrid, 1913, p. 269.

²⁴ S. P. Spain 181. Gray to Weymouth, 27 March, 1769. "This ingenious officer, Ulloa, was formerly sent to America with Don Gorge Juan to measure a

the fifth of March, 1766, accompanied by five officers, two civil officials, two Capucines, and the small force of ninety troops, Ulloa entered New Orleans.²⁵ Officially, he was correctly received, but from the inhabitants over whom he had come to rule no enthusiastic welcome was extended or could have been well expected. Through the preceding months the information that the sovereignty of the land, with whose fortunes their own were bound up, had been changed had been withheld from the residents of Louisiana—the French court even appointing a new governor in June of 1764 without divulging the secret. When finally rumor carried word of their misfortune and protest was attempted, they had been informed that the king's decision was irrevocably taken and they must either quietly transfer their loyalty to the Catholic king or take advantage of their privilege to emigrate to one of the French West Indies, or to France. The actual appearance of the representatives of the new government created general consternation, bringing a full realisation of the significance of the step which had been taken. Not only did those who personally knew the natural riches of Louisiana mourn the great loss this cession meant to France, but to the majority the coming of the new governor meant personal financial ruin. It was generally understood that Ulloa brought with him no authority to promise the conversion of the great quantities of depreciated paper currency whose existence constituted the greatest evil under which the country labored.²⁶ His offer to allow this paper to continue in use in business transactions at the value it then bore gave no satisfaction. The holders preferred to cling to the vain hope that had hitherto buoyed them up, that the French king would in time redeem his obligations in full. Again, the future wore the darkest

degree of the meridian at the equator. On his return to Spain he was made a prisoner at Louisberg and brought to England, where he remained several months, greatly satisfied with the humane and generous treatment he met with, particularly in the restoring of his papers containing a journal of his voyage and observations of which he makes grateful mention in his printed account of them".

²⁵ A. N. Colonie F 3/25, fol. 35. Lettre des Ades. de la Louisiana au ministre, 8 March, 1766. Also fol. 35. D'Aubry au ministre, 12 May, 1766.

²⁶ A. N. Colonie. F 3/25, fol. 35. Lettre de M. Foucault au ministre, 10 March, 1766.

color to all those interested in trade. The strictness with which Spain excluded all the other nations from any share in the trade of her American possessions was notorious and no one cherished the delusion that the new province could hope to enjoy for long a place of special favor. Within the Spanish commercial system there appeared no place for such products as Louisiana had to offer. Warm Spain could make little or no use of furs; the sale of tobacco, except that of Cuban growth, was forbidden in the peninsula; Guatemala supplied all the indigo that was needed, and Havana was said to be in no need of Louisiana wood. If the markets of France and the French West Indies were closed, the country was faced with commercial disaster. Discontent came to a head when the newcomer asked that the French soldiers in Louisiana should be transferred from the French to the Spanish service. Wishing to assist the new governor in what was foreseen to be a difficult task, the French king had sent orders that, if the favor was asked for, the three hundred French soldiers at New Orleans should take the oath of allegiance to the new sovereign.²⁷ This the soldiers absolutely refused to do, declaring that their leave was long overdue and that any change would mean long detention in a country they were now anxious to leave.²⁸

With the support of the French troops denied him, Ulloa refused to take formal possession of the country until such time as the full situation had been communicated to his government and new orders and new reinforcements had been received by him. Meanwhile he undertook to make himself familiar with every section of the country by personal inspection, while the two Frenchmen, M. d'Aubry, the commandant, and M. Foucault, the commissaire, with the help of the supreme council, continued to administer the country as formerly, with the understanding that henceforth the Spanish, instead of the French, king would be responsible for the expenses of government.²⁹

²⁷ A. N. Colonie, F 3/25, fol. 31. Le ministre à M. D'Abbadie, 13 May, 1764.

²⁸ A. N. Colonie, F 3/25, fol. 37. M. Foucault au ministre, 2 April, 1766.

²⁹ A. N. Colonie, F 3/25, fol. 37. D'Aubry au ministre, 28 May, 1766. Also fol. 36, D'Aubry au ministre, 28 March, 1766; fol. 35, D'Aubry au ministre, 12 March, 1766; fol. 40, D'Aubry au ministre, 15 July, 1767.

Under this provisional system, as the Spanish reinforcements failed to make their appearance, Louisiana was governed for more than two years.³⁰ In this time of grace Ulloa not only utterly failed to ingratiate himself with the inhabitants, but his haughty behavior increased their apprehension of what would befall them after the formal occupation. As D'Aubry reported, Ulloa, despite his scholastic attainments recognised in all the academies of Europe, was not the man to govern Louisiana.³¹ The crisis came in October, 1768, as a result of news confirming the fears of the inhabitants as to the future fate of their commerce.

After Ulloa's landing trade had been conducted on the basis of a compromise, commerce with the two French islands of St. Dominique and Martinique and with France being permitted on a system of passports. Although grievances accumulated, tranquillity prevailed on the whole until on October 28, 1768, the report arrived that the Spanish governor had come to the decision that Louisiana was to be incorporated forthwith into the Spanish American commercial system and all trade with foreign powers forbidden.³² Practically the whole French population rose in arms.³³ The commandant was forced to call a meeting of the supreme council which, when summoned, placed itself at the head of the opposition to Spain. An order of the council after setting forth Ulloa's failings at full length, commanded him to leave the country within three days with his family and the two Capucines. On M. d'Aubry's recommendation he obeyed, withdrawing in a Spanish vessel to Havana, from where he went to Spain to render an account of the whole affair.³⁴ Meanwhile from New Orleans special deputies were

³⁰ A. N. Colonie F 3/25, fol. 36, D'Aubry au ministre, 28 March, 1766; also fol. 38, 9 July, 1766; fol. 37, Foucault au ministre, 2 April, 1766.

³¹ A. N. F 3/25, fol. 47, D'Aubry au ministre, 8 Nov., 1768.

³² A. N. F 3/25, fol. 40, D'Aubry au ministre, 28 Nov., 1768; also fol. 41, D'Aubry au ministre, 28 Dec., 1768.

³³ A. N. F 3/25, fol. 47, D'Aubry au ministre, 8 Nov., 1768. Cf. also *Documentos Históricos de Luisiana*, Madrid, 1913, p. 272: Certificación del intendente de nueva Orleans, Don Esteban Gagarre, de lo acaecido en la sublevación de los Franceses. Nueva Orleans, 30 d'Octubre de 1760.

³⁴ S. P. Spain 181. Gray to Weymouth, 27 February, 1769. "Don Antonio Ulloa who was drove away from New Orleans is come hither to give an account

despatched with long memorials to the French court,³⁵ which, however, returned no warmer answer than a recommendation that the inhabitants throw themselves at once on the mercy of his Catholic majesty and ask forgiveness for their presumptuous behavior.³⁶

In Spain the news of the rebellion caused the immediate summoning of a council of ministers who expressed the opinion that Louisiana should be retained as Spanish territory. As also the king was strongly of the opinion that a successful revolt in Louisiana, if allowed to remain unpunished, would have a bad effect in other parts of America, the decision was reached that Don Alejandro O'Reilly an inspector and lieutenant-general in the army who was then preparing to leave for Havana and other New World points to inspect troops, should be secretly commissioned to gather what troops and supplies he considered necessary at Havana and proceed to Louisiana. After taking formal possession he was to reduce the country to obedience, punishing the leaders of the late revolt, expelling those who were not likely to live in quiet, and to establish Spanish administration upon a firm foundation.³⁷

of an extraordinary transaction". *Ibid.*, 6 February, 1769. "A very extraordinary scene has passed at New Orleans where the French have ordered Don Antonio Ulloa, the intended Spanish governor, who came to take possession of it, to depart with the rest of his countrymen and in consequence they immediately embarked for Havana where they actually arrived a few days before the departure of the last packet. The new Spanish regulations have been the cause of this violent step which gave such general dissatisfaction to the inhabitants that they determined not to submit to them, so that the Intendent and Council found it expedient to order the Spaniards to quit the place and have sent a deputation to the French court to justify their conduct. Upon asking Grimaldi, from whom I had this information, what were the regulations the French inhabitants objected to, he told me the putting New Orleans upon the same footing with other Spanish ports in America by excluding all foreign vessels. . . . He is undoubtedly much chagrined at the behaviour of the French upon this and many other accounts though he endeavoured to dissemble it and even to excuse the French."

³⁵ A. N. Colonie, F 3/25, fols. 42, 43, 44. Memorial issued by the supreme council dated 29 October, 1768. *Ibid.* fols. 45, 46, 47. Memorial of the Inhabitants of Louisiana, dated 29 October, 1768.

³⁶ A. N. Colonie F 3/25, fol. 48. Le ministre a D'Aubry et Foucault, 12 Dec., 1769.

³⁷ A. N. Colonie F 3/25, fol. 41. Grimaldi a M. de Fuentes, 1769. (No date.)

General O'Reilly reached New Orleans on August 18, 1769. Supported by an overwhelming force³⁸ he experienced little or no difficulty in raising the Spanish flag over the country. The leaders of the new revolt were punished, but on the whole the king's injunction to be lenient as well as firm was adhered to.³⁹ Louisiana was, however, forced for the succeeding decade to take her place in the general trade system of Spanish America, with the result that within a few years, despite some favor shown by the government, the forebodings of its French inhabitants had been realized.⁴⁰ The arbitrary system of administration the exclusion of all commerce but Spanish, the presence of the inquisition which frightened away foreign settlers, and the large emigration of its French inhabitants to the French West Indies, soon brought the same spirit of discouragement and inactivity to Louisiana as characterized so much of Spanish America in its most prosperous days.

³⁸ *Documentos Históricos de la Florida y la Luisiana en siglos XVI al XVIII*, p. 296, Madrid, 1913. Relacion de como D. Alejandro O'Reilly pacificó la ciudad de Nueva Orleans. Nueva Orleans, 30 Agosto de 1769. "La tropa se componía de un batallon de Lisboa: otro del Fijo de la Havana; 150 artilleros, 40 dragones, 150 soldados de las milicias de caballería del monte de la Havana; con 150 fusileros catalanes; 80 hombres de una compañía de granaderos de cada uno de los tres cuerpos de milicias de la Havana."

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 304-312. Nueva Orleans, 31 de Agosto de 1769. Carta de D. Alejandro O'Reilly a D. Julian de Arriaga dandole cuenta de su viaje a Nueva Orleans y de lo que habia hecho en esta ciudad.

⁴⁰ A. N. Colonie F 3/25. fol. 49. Annonce d'une Association patriotique, San Domingo, Dec., 1773.

Ibid., fol. 50. Villars, "Memoire", Nueve Orleans, 31 March, 1778.

CHAPTER II

ANGLO-SPANISH RELATIONS IN AMERICA

The relations of the English and Spanish crowns in the years following the conclusion of peace in 1763 centered largely round the new conditions created in America by the transfer of territory and the interpretation of privileges conferred by the terms of the treaty. The major operations called for by the instrument of peace were not those which provided the most serious difficulties. Thus West Florida was exchanged for Havana with little friction, but the settlement of the respective rights under the treaty of the two nations in Central America brought the courts well in sight of a new break. The future sovereignty of the Mosquito Coast became the first item in the controversy.

The part of Central America known as Mosquitia or the Mosquito Coast⁴¹ was not mentioned by name in the Treaty of Paris, but through the ambiguous wording of Article 17 became involved when the execution of the instrument was undertaken. In 1763, the country was inhabited by some ten thousand persons of whom eight thousand were native Indians and the remainder two thousand English settlers and their slaves. This strip of the Caribbean seacoast had been in the possession of the Mosquito Indians ever since it had been known to Europeans. Repeated endeavors of Spain to incorporate it in the surrounding Spanish American system had been successfully resisted, largely through the assistance of the English with whom the connection of the Indians had been close since the early days of the seven-

⁴¹ Robert Hodgson, Superintendent on the Shore, in a paper dated Oct. 12, 1766, and entitled "A View of Mosquito Shore" described the country as "situated on Tierra firma of America about 100 league S. W. of Jamaica. Cape Gracias a Dios in the fifteenth degree of N. latitude is about in the centre of its seacoast which reaches from Cape Honduras to the northernmost branch of the Desaguadero, about eighty leagues. Between this seacoast and the distant almost impassable mountains which bound the Spanish territory behind lies as fine a tract of land as any in the world. . . . " C O 123 I.

teenth century. At that time English freebooters had found the Mosquito harbors a convenience in their operations against the Spanish, and the natives had discovered in these Europeans resourceful allies in their struggle against the same enemy.⁴² In the twenty years immediately preceding the Treaty of Paris this relationship had become closer and assumed a more official character. In 1744, when England was in open hostility with Spain, the governor of Jamaica had received orders to despatch a detachment of soldiers to the Shore. A few years later a blockhouse had been erected at Black River and, in 1749, these steps had been followed by the appointment of the first English superintendent,⁴³ at a salary of five hundred pounds a year, with instructions "to regulate and superintend the Settlement on the Mosquito Shore . . . and regularly to inform the governor of Jamaica now and for the time being of your proceedings and follow the instructions he shall think proper to give you, for the good of this particular service". Under this arrangement⁴⁴

⁴² C O 123, I. "An Account of the Musketoe Shore", by Joseph Smith Speers, Lieutenant in H. M. 49th Regiment, and the Captain of a force at Black River on the Shore, 1760. "These brave Indians have maintained their freedom against the Spaniards from the first attempt and conquest of Mexico to this time. . . . The first knowledge and footing the English seem to have had of this part of the coast began on taking possession of the logwood trade in the Bay of Honduras in the reign of Henry VIII, at which time and ever since these Indians have maintained an inviolable friendship and attachment to the English despising all other people and in all wars with Spain this has been an asylum and safe retreat for the Baymen."

"In the reign of Charles II one of the Musketoe kings was prevailed with to come to England and then gave a patent to the king of a free possession of the Musketoe Coast and the Indians have . . . encouraged the English to settle there ever since, and have continually called on the English officers to decide their disputes and for many years have accepted of commissions from the governor of Jamaica or the commanding officer . . . on the Shore; by which means they have marshalled under King, General, Admiral, Colonels, Captains, etc., and by a policy practised some years past have been kept from attacking the Spaniards in the times the English were at peace by annual presents allowed in the contingent account of the Shore. . . ."

⁴³ C O 123 II. "Memorial of the Principal Inhabitants of the Mosquitoe Shore," 26 January, 1779. The earliest form of regulation appears to have been that of a civil police consisting of justices of the peace and quarter sessions instituted by the governor of Jamaica.

⁴⁴ C O 123, I. "At the Court at Kensington the 19th day of July, 1744. Present the King's most excellent Majesty in Council . . . it is hereby ordered

the country enjoyed for a number of years unusual peace and prosperity. These happy conditions came to a close in 1763 when the question arose of applying Article 17 of the Treaty of Paris to the Mosquito shore. This clause stipulated that Great Britain "shall cause to be demolished the fortifications which her subjects shall have erected in the Bay of Honduras and in other places of the territory of Spain in that part of the world".

The *Rose* ship of war arrived at the Shore from Jamaica in September, 1763, bearing a letter from Governor Lyttleton to Robert Hodgson,⁴⁵ the officer in command of the British troops in Mosquitia, enclosing the warrant for executing Article 17 and commanding him to despatch immediately all British soldiers, guns, and stores to Jamaica and demolish all fortifications

that Edward Trelawny, Esq., H. M. Governor of Jamaica and Colonel of the regiment there do cause a detachment to be sent from the said regiment to the Mosquito Shore consisting of one company or otherwise as he shall judge the necessity of the service to require, and H. M. doth hereby authorize and empower the governor of the said island for the time being to lay out small sums as shall be requisite for the service above mentioned, taking care that no more be expended therein than what should be absolutely necessary and not exceeding the sums contained in the above report."

The sums mentioned in the report are: 300 pounds per annum for presents to the Indians; 500 pounds per annum for "such contingencies as the nature of such a service must require; 1330 pounds "on account of several necessities which were thought proper by Governor Trelawny to be provided for upon the first establishing and quartering the independent company on the Mosquito shore".

The troops appear to have been withdrawn in 1751, but had been returned by 1756. C O 123, I, Governor Trelawny to the Lords of Trade, 17 July, 1751, and C O 123, II, "Memorial of the Principal Inhabitants of the Mosquito Shore", 26 January, 1779.

C O 123, I. "The Mosquito settlement", says Trelawny, "ever since we have had Jamaica has been under the care of the governor and looked upon as a Dependence of this Island, the King of the Indians receiving a commission for being so from the Governor of Jamaica, which I know, because it has fallen to my lot, unworthy as I am, to commission a King."

⁴⁵ The first superintendent was Captain Hodgson. He was succeeded by Captain Otway, who, in 1768, was superseded by Mr. Robert Hodgson, son of the first superintendent. He held office until August 1775, when he was recalled, on petition of the inhabitants, to England. On 29 December, 1775, John Ferguson was commissioned by the Governor of Jamaica to act as superintendent of the Shore, and he arrived on 11 January, 1776, and proceeded to set up a new government, consisting of an elected council of twelve, a court of common pleas, and a Board of Justices of the Peace, after which "universal content reigned". C O 123, II.

erected by the British on the Shore. It was evident from these orders that Governor Lyttleton regarded Mosquitia as comprehended in "other places of the territory of Spain in that part of the world". The inhabitants and officials being of quite another mind, the ship of war and the accompanying transport were within a week sent back to Jamaica empty of soldiers or military stores but bearing a letter to the governor. This document pointed out that Mosquitia was not, and never had been, Spanish territory, but on the contrary, was considered a British possession, and that it was thought on the Shore that this order had been issued under a misapprehension. In reply came nothing more comforting than a peremptory command to despatch the troops and stores at once in the transport which was returned. In February, 1764, in obedience to a second order, the block-house was dismantled and the soldiers returned to Jamaica. Two weeks later a letter arrived from the secretary of state, the Earl of Halifax, dated December the ninth, 1763, stating that the Mosquito shore was a British settlement and was to be maintained and encouraged, "whereupon all the cannon was fired off for joy at the fears which had begun to take place lest it was intended to be deserted, being so happily dispelled".⁴⁶ The troops, however, were not returned and to their absence the residents of Mosquito in petition after petition ascribed all the ills from which they suffered in the succeeding years.

That the Spaniards were watching events closely and considered that the withdrawal of the British soldiers signified England's resolution to allow the dominion of Mosquitia to pass to them was evidenced by the arrival on the shore, within a fortnight of the sailing of the transport, of a Spanish officer charged with the duty of taking possession of the country. Unfortunately for the success of his mission the letter from the British secretary of state had preceded him. Accordingly his reception was not flattering. Cannon shot greeted his attempt to land without the usual formalities. When these had been complied with and

⁴⁶ C O 123, I. Relation of what passed on the Mosquito Shore at and about the time of the execution of the seventeenth Article of the Peace, by Robert Hodgson, 23 Dec., 1766.

he was at last on shore the English citizens politely and coldly assured him, in reply to his questions, that the departure of the troops had nothing whatever to do with the Treaty of Paris. There were several excellent reasons, he was told, for their return at that time to Jamaica. In the first place the Jamaican Assembly had just resolved that the additional allowance hitherto made to all troops attached to that station was in the future to be confined to those in the immediate service of the island, and, secondly, the regiment of which the Mosquito soldiers had formed a part, was under orders to proceed to Europe as soon as another, which was daily expected, arrived to relieve it. The welcome from the natives was even more unsatisfactory. Suspecting his purpose the Indians had collected in large numbers and were only with the greatest difficulty restrained by the English from making the lieutenant-colonel from Guatemala a sacrifice to their hatred of his nation. Before the day was over he was very thankful to avail himself of the protecting roof of the English "father of the settlement" until such time as the wind and surf made a return to his boat and prompt departure possible.⁴⁷

In the period which these events opened and which was to close only with a renewal of open hostilities, England pursued on the Mosquito Coast what the inhabitants described as a

⁴⁷ C O 123, II. To the Right Hon. Lords of Trade and Plantations the reply of H. M. subjects, the Principal Inhabitants of the Mosquito Shore in America to the printed pamphlet, entitled *The Defence of Robert Hodgson* (1780). "This much we know that this seventeenth article was considered by the Spaniards as meant to give them the dominion of the shore; agreeably to which idea a Spanish officer of distinction, soone after the peace, arrived there, and demanded possession of it. . . . Captain Otway was at the time superintendent, who behaved upon the occasion with great prudence and propriety; and Mr. William Pitt, father of the settlement during his lifetime, took the Spanish officer under his roof and protection for one night as the surf on the bar rendered his return on shipboard impracticable, but it required all his unequalled influence over the Indians to effect this officer's preservation whilst on land, and his safe return to the vessel the next day. For suspecting his business, the Mosquito men were ardent to resent the injury by making him a sacrifice to their vengeance against the Spaniards."

Cf. C O 123, I. "Relation of what passed on Mosquito shore at and about the time of the execution of the seventeenth Article of the Peace", by Robert Hodgson, 23 December, 1766.

"cautious equivocal" policy.⁴⁸ She neither wholly withdrew from the country nor yet maintained sovereignty over it openly by countenancing a garrison to afford protection to the colony. As late as February, 1777, the council of Jamaica placed itself on record as being of the opinion that the governor was restrained by the seventeenth article of the Treaty of Paris from complying with the prayers of the inhabitants of the Mosquito coast and sending troops there. Yet a superintendent was kept on the Shore and the Spaniards understood that in any attempt at open encroachment on Mosquito territory they would have to face forces from Jamaica as well as the Mosquito Indian levies.

As neither the Spanish nor the British court wished for open hostilities on a Mosquito shore issue their respective subjects and dependents in Central America were reduced to rendering each other as uncomfortable as possible through an unending series of annoying practices. The custom of their Spanish neighbors to which the Mosquito inhabitants most objected was the open encouragement given to their negro slaves to desert to the Spanish settlements. Demands for their return were usually refused on the ground that the negroes had sought Christianity among the Spaniards and were detained for instruction in true religious principles.⁴⁹ In retaliation, any Spaniard or Spanish

⁴⁸ C O 123, II. "Memorial from the settlers of the Mosquito Coast" to Lord North, 29 Sept., 1783. "Your Memorialists wish to put you in mind of the well known disposition of the Court of Spain and its commanding officers in Guatemala and other governments of the Isthmus of America and of the many open and secret attempts made by them to reduce this country to the obedience of His Catholic Majesty in time of profound peace, from 1763 to the war of 1779, during which time, as well as during the whole course of the late war, the conduct of H. M. Government here as well as at Jamaica, has been so cautious, equivocal and discouraging as not only to prevent the settlement and commerce of the country from increasing by new settlers and men of property going down to it, but has essentially ruined your Memorialists settled here by leaving them altogether unprotected to the invasion, conquest, and plunder of the enemy in April, 1780, and March 1782." The despatch closes with an appeal for a detachment of 100 men and officers to be stationed at Black River and another at Cape Gracias à Dios.

⁴⁹ Joseph Otway, superintendent of the Shore, in a letter to the Earl of Halifax written from Black River, 20 Jan., 1766, gives an account of one incident of this nature. "I dispatched a letter by a person whom I furnished with a flag of truce . . . to Don Francisco Aybar, Commandant of His Catholic Majesty's town

dependent found wandering in Mosquito territory was fortunate if he escaped with his life. In the late sixties the English settlers discovered that Spanish activities had taken on a new form and that their white neighbors were carrying on secret propaganda work among the Mosquito Indians, leaving to the settlers' minds no shadow of doubt that their fixed intention was to subdue the Mosquito shore.⁵⁰ Disturbing proofs of this intrigue were found in 1769 when a letter from Don José de Neva, the Spanish governor of Cartago, to Admiral Dillson a Mosquito chief, came to light.⁵¹ Captain Forrest, in charge of the ship at the Jamaica station wrote to the secretary of the admiralty in

of St. Fernando de Omoa . . . for the restitution of 7 negro slaves who deserted from hence on the night of the 16 August, 1765. . . . Aybar, with great indecency of language, denied H. M.'s having any settlement on the Mosquito shore or officer at the place and regarded the commission of the flag of truce as unauthentic and confined the person . . . on board a Spanish brigantine of war. He asserted that as the negroes in question had come to seek Christianity among them he had sent them to Guatemala to be instructed in Christian principles." C O 123, I.

Otway's letter to the Spanish commandant, dated 2 Sept., 1765, is of interest. ". . . there is the strongest reason to believe the desertion of the before-mentioned negroes was occasioned by the persuasions of some mulattoes, subjects to His Catholic Majesty, all of whom I have taken into custody and shall keep them confined until such time as I receive a satisfactory answer regarding the negroes. If you shall delay or refuse . . . I shall proceed with the Spanish mulattoes according to our laws and shall make representations for the redress of His Britannic Majesty's subjects." C O 123, I.

C O 123, II. In a memorial to the Rt. Hon. Lord George Germain from the principal inhabitants of Mosquito Shore, dated 26 Sept., 1779, it is stated, "The desertion of negroes has been immense and most distressing ever since the unfortunate period when the troops were withdrawn".

⁵⁰ C O 123, II. "Memorial to the Rt. Hon. Lord George Germain from the Principal Inhabitants of Mosquito Shore", 26 Sept., 1779. "Long, secret, and industrious measures to influence the Indians leave no shadow of doubt of their fixed intention to subdue the Mosquito Shore." For reference to the conspiracy of Don José de Neva, Spanish Governor of Cartago, to extirpate all H. M.'s subjects from the Mosquito shore in the course of the spring and summer of 1769, see C O 123, II, "The Reply of H. M.'s Subjects, the Principal Inhabitants of the Mosquito Shore", in answer to the Pamphlet entitled *The Defence of Robert Hodgson*, 1780.

⁵¹ S. P. Spain 183. Forrest to Stephens, Jamaica, 8 Oct., 1769. "From a letter from the Mosquito Shore to the Governor of Jamaica we seem to be in a fair way of losing the interest we have so long preserved amongst Mosquito men who have hitherto been our fast friends and inveterate enemies to the Spaniards."

the autumn of that year, "We seem to be in a fair way of losing the interest we have so long preserved among the Mosquito men who have hitherto been our firm friends and inveterate enemies to the Spaniards". When to the settlers' troubles with their neighbors were added domestic trials with a new superintendent, these British subjects felt their measure of woes to be full to overflowing. Robert Hodgson, superintendent in 1767, attempted to carry into effect, on what the settlers regarded as insufficient authority, constitutional changes involving the independence of the Shore from Jamaica.⁵² The oppressive power assumed by this ambitious official made him obnoxious to the Indians and, the settlers believed, provided the watchful Spaniards with an opportunity favorable for trying the effect of presents, flattery, and insinuations on the loyalty of the Mosquitos.⁵³ The despatch of an experienced Indian negotiator from Jamaica, bearing presents for the Indians, the recall of the unpopular superintendent, and the establishment by Sir Basil Keith of a new government relieved the more pressing difficulties,⁵⁴ but life on the Mosquito shore continued a precarious matter subject to constant alarms and annoyances through the whole period between 1763 and 1779.

The difficulties between Spaniards and Englishmen on the Mosquito shore were reflected only very slightly in the diplomatic correspondence of the two countries, but the troubles which centered about the application of the Treaty of Paris to another portion of Central America occupied the official representatives many months, and culminated in a diplomatic crisis only less acute than that famous under the name of the Falkland Island incident. Eighty leagues to the north of the Mosquito coast was that section of the Bay of Honduras frequented from the seventeenth century onwards by British logwood cutters. The con-

⁵² C O 123, I. "Some Thoughts on proper measures to be taken for settling the Mosquito Shore," by Robert Hodgson, 12 Oct., 1766.

⁵³ S. P. Spain 183. Forrest to Stephens, 8 Oct., 1769.

⁵⁴ Robert Hodgson, on the petition of the inhabitants was recalled in August, 1775. Sir Basil Keith, Governor of Jamaica, appointed John Ferguson superintendent of the Mosquito shore, 29 December, 1775. He arrived to take up his new work on the 11 January, 1776.

nection between the two British settlements in Central America had long been close. Through the years while the logwood cutters were making their determined fight to secure a footing in this section of Spanish America, they repeatedly found Mosquitia a welcome place of retreat from the persecution of the Spaniards. Many of them had families and maintained plantations on the friendly shore.⁵⁵ Previous to the Treaty of Paris the cutters could point to no visible bonds uniting them either to Jamaica or to the home government such as connected their neighbors to the British system. Magistrates elected in a public meeting furnished their only form of civic organization. There was no superintendent, no company of soldiers, and no block-house. One of the concessions insisted upon at Paris by the British negotiators in recognition of the magnificent victory which had attended English arms in the Seven Years' War was a recognition by Spain of the right of the British logwood cutters to continue their operations in the Bay of Honduras. This was in the Treaty in the seventeenth article which stipulated on the part of Great Britain that "His Britannic Majesty shall cause to be demolished the fortifications which his subjects shall have erected in the Bay of Honduras and other places of the territory of Spain in that part of the world"; on the part of the king of Spain that "His Catholic Majesty shall not permit His Britannic Majesty's subjects or their workmen to be disturbed or molested under any pretence whatsoever, in the said places, in their occupation of cutting, loading, and carrying away logwood; and for this purpose they may build without hindrance and occupy without interruption the houses and magazines which are necessary for them, for their families, and for their effects".

Within a month of the signing of the treaty, which at last endowed them with a recognized position, the logwood cutters were back in their old positions on the Bay.⁵⁶ The governor of Yucatan was shortly afterwards informed of their arrival, assured

⁵⁵ C O 125, I. Petition to the King, 31 May, 1766.

⁵⁶ Petition from the Principal Settlers in the Bay of Honduras to William Henry Lyttleton, Governor of Jamaica, undated. Enclosed in S. P. Spain 167, Halifax to Rochford, 15 June, 1764.

that there were no British fortifications, and requested to order the commandant of Bacalar, the nearest Spanish officer, to offer no embarrassment to them.⁵⁷ For months the British cutters were left undisturbed, but on the fourth of February, 1764, a corporal and three soldiers from the nearby Spanish garrison of San Felipe arrived at the Río Hondo, where the logwood cutters were engaged, bearing a letter from the governor of Yucatan ordering them to withdraw until such time as they could produce either a *cedula* from his Catholic majesty or a license from the British king.⁵⁸ As evidence that the command was to be enforced, the Spanish post called "Look-out St. Antony" commanding the mouth of the Río Hondo, was strengthened and the garrison ordered to prevent English vessels from entering the river.⁵⁹ Leaving behind them twenty-two merchant vessels

⁵⁷ Letter from Joseph Maud, one of the principal logwood cutters, to the governor of Yucatan, 23 May, 1763, enclosed by Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764. S. P. Spain, 167. Also extract from a letter from Lieutenant Hodgson to Governor Lyttleton, dated Black River, Mosquito Shore, 2 Nov., 1763, enclosed by Halifax to Rochford, 24 July, 1764. "On pursuance of the King's warrant and Your Excellency's letter I repaired to the Bay of Honduras . . . and visited those parts where there was a probability of any fortifications having been erected by British subjects . . . and declare that there are no fortifications, troops, artillery, or stores belonging to His Britannic Majesty in the Bay of Honduras."

⁵⁸ Petition of the Principal Settlers to Lord Lyttleton in S. P. Spain 167, Halifax to Rochford, 15 June, 1764. Cf. Testimony of Jeremiah Balfour, master of the brigantine *Inflexible* of the port of Kingston, who was employed by the cutters to carry their petition to Jamaica, dated 9 April, 1764, and enclosed in S. P. Spain 167, Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764.

Letter from the Governor of Yucatan to Mr. Joseph Maud, one of the principal logwood cutters, 29 Dec., 1763, enclosed in S. P. Spain 167, Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764. ". . . I have detached the commandant of the Fort Bacalar with this requiring you that in consideration of the want of instruments necessary for your introduction and having extended yourselves for the produce of the country as though your own without waiting that the limits be fixed with the necessary solemnities that should have secured your establishments, you will be pleased with great promptitude to give the necessary orders that all of your nation that are in the Río Hondo retire to Balis and wait until they present me with the Royal Schedule that the King my master dispatched to that end, or orders from the King of England for that purpose which there is no doubt I shall attend to with the care and equity I am commanded. . . ."

⁵⁹ Copy of an order from Don Joseph Rosado, commandant of Fort Bacalar, 22 Feb., 1764, enclosed in S. P. Spain 167, Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764.

deprived of their loadings and in a most "miserable and melancholy situation and in a starving condition", five or six hundred British settlers withdrew to Balis, an old, deserted settlement, and to New River, a more recent cutting.⁶⁰ From this latter place they were also shortly driven away and told that unless they wished to suffer the loss of their slaves and violent arrest, they would assemble and remain at Balis.⁶¹ Meanwhile a specially hired vessel bore an account of their troubles and an appeal for help to Jamaica. But as Sir William Burnaby's letter of remonstrance to the governor of Yucatan brought only an unsatisfactory reply, it was left for the home Government to secure redress from the Spanish court.⁶²

In sending information of the affair to the British ambassador in Madrid the instructions of the secretary of state were to secure the despatch of positive orders obliging the Spanish governor to restore to British subjects the free enjoyment of those rights "the obstruction of which has so evident a tendency to interrupt the good correspondence which so happily subsists between the

⁶⁰ S. P. Spain 167. Testimony of Jeremiah Balfour, 9 April, 1764, in Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764.

⁶¹ S. P. Spain 167. Copy of order from Don Joseph Rosado. "Notwithstanding that the Serjeant Dionisius Chavaria who is detached to the Lookout of St. Antony has necessary orders that the English logwood cutters of Rio Hondo retire to Balis without any demur, in consideration that since the 4th instant when I intimated to them the order of my Governor and Captain General they had had sufficient time to evacuate the River carrying out all the utensils of their houses, I order and command the said serjeant to receive eleven soldiers of this garrison well armed that with four there before complete the number of fifteen that are to remain at the said Lookout that with them he do not permit any English vessels to enter the mouth of this River on any pretence whatsoever. If any [cutters] remain in the river they are to go out immediately . . . with so much brevity that he do not permit them to detain or stop anywhere but retire totally, likewise those to the New River, because in the order intimated to them before it is expressed that the retreat is to Balis and to no other part, and on the contrary they will be exposed to an evident danger and by their disobedience they may lose their negroes and find themselves under violent arrest."

⁶² *Ibid.*, Burnaby to D. Philip Ramirez de Esteños, enclosed by Halifax to Rochford, 3 July, 1764. This letter set forth that by the seventeenth article of the Treaty of Paris the cutters required no instruments in order to reestablish themselves in the Bay.

two crowns".⁶³ A second letter stated that the king insisted on reparation and redress.⁶⁴ For a month Rochford could secure no satisfactory reply to his representations.⁶⁵ In answer to his office, the Spanish foreign minister, the Marquis Grimaldi,⁶⁶ only expressed vague disapproval of the governor's action should events turn out to be such as the ambassador believed them. It was necessary, he asserted, to await information from Spanish-American sources before taking action.⁶⁷ Not until the British representative significantly pointed out "that this had been the cause of more than one war" could a serious hearing be secured.⁶⁸

In the discussions that followed it developed that the governor of Yucatan had acted on orders signed by Don Julian de Arriaga, president of the council of the Indies, commanding him to "observe exactly the letter of the treaty, to take care the English go nowhere but where they are entitled to go as they are subjects likely to encroach".⁶⁹ The American official had interpreted this to mean that the logwood cutters were to be confined to the particular places in the bay where previously they had been in the habit of cutting logwood. As he believed the Río Hondo did not

⁶³ S. P. Spain, 167. Halifax to Rochford, 15 June, 1764.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 3 July, 1764.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Rochford to Halifax, 8 July, 1764. The first office from Rochford to Grimaldi on the affair was dated 4 July, 1764.

⁶⁶ Pablo Heronimo Grimaldi, Palavicini y Spinola, Marqués di Grimaldi. Foreign minister of Spain from October, 1763, to 1777. As Spanish ambassador to France, 1761-63, Grimaldi had carried through the negotiation for the famous Family Compact (signed August the fifteenth, 1761) and the accompanying Secret Convention providing for the application of the principles of the pact to the Seven Years' War then in progress. Later he signed the Preliminaries of Fontainebleau, 4 November, 1762, and the final Treaty of Paris, 10 Feb., 1763. On the retirement of General Wall, Charles called Grimaldi to the first place in his council. He assumed his duties as foreign minister, 14 October, 1763. By the British ambassador he was regarded as hopelessly pro-French in his sympathies. Rochford once wrote that Grimaldi was "more a tool of Choiseul the French Foreign Minister than he was of His Catholic Majesty's". S. P. Spain, 166, Rochford to Halifax—most secret—13 Jan., 1764.

⁶⁷ S. P. Spain 167, Grimaldi to Rochford, 7 July, 1764, enclosed by Rochford to Halifax, 8 July, 1764.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* Rochford to Halifax, 30 July, 1764.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* Rochford to Halifax, 14 September, 1764 (and continued later). "Both Grimaldi and Squilace lay the whole blame of this affair on Arriaga who signed the original instructions to the Governor of Yucatan".

come under this description the incident at that place had been an attempt to carry his general principle into practice. The line taken by the British government was not to insist on the Río Hondo being a former settlement as the settlers asserted it was, but to insist that the seventeenth article should be recognized by the Spanish government as giving to the British a general liberty to cut logwood "in the Bay of Honduras and other places in the territory of Spain in that part of the world". The Spanish government, on the other hand, wished to secure a clear definition of the geographical limits to the privilege. The secretary of state made it perfectly clear that in return for a precise understanding his government was prepared to be generous in the matter of boundaries. Grimaldi's words in the course of a conversation with Rochford were "All you could have asked would and will be granted to you. You shall have full liberty to cut at Río Hondo, Río Nueve, and everywhere along the coast, and instead of modifying the Treaty we are willing to amplify it, but as you have no right nor do you pretend to have a right to go to Mexico, why do you object to declaring it?"⁷⁰ Rochford wrote that the attitude of the Spanish minister was based on a "determined belief that our people have nothing else in view but to cut at places most convenient for them to carry on illegal trade".⁷¹ The ambassador learned from the Spanish

⁷⁰ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 14 September, 1764.

That Rochford at first was in favor of definitely settling boundaries is clear from his letter of 6 August, 1764, S. P. 168. "I do not know whether it is the King's intention or desire to have this article explained or not, but I foresee that unless it is there will be no end of differences between our logwood cutters and the Spanish Governor as to granting us places where there is the greatest quantity of wood and the greatest convenience . . . I am persuaded I should find all sorts of facility from the ministers here . . . and I cannot help observing that this opportunity is a most favorable one for adjusting it". Rochford's views were not acquiesced in at home and he successfully carried through the interpretation desired by Halifax.

⁷¹ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 6 August, 1764.

It is noteworthy that the Governor of Yucatan did not support this view. Rochford reported to Halifax (S. P. Spain, 169, 7 June, 1765), that in a recent letter from the Governor of Yucatan to Arriaga "the Governor represents that he did not perceive the least design of our people's endeavour to carry on any illicit trade".

minister that during the war the king had actually proposed to burn all the logwood trees in that part of the world in order to prevent all possible future connection with the English there, which scheme, "though a wild one" commented Rochford, "shows how possessed they are of our people carrying on an illicit trade under the pretence of cutting logwood".⁷²

Assured by the British ambassador that he was "perfectly satisfied that there is nothing they will not do to avoid quarrelling with us at this time", the English government refused to enter into any negotiations looking towards an interpretation of the vague words of the treaty, insisting that, preliminary to any discussion must come a disavowal of the Yucatan governor's proceedings, the re-establishment of the logwood cutters in the places from which they had been driven, and reparation for the injuries sustained.⁷³ After an interview held on the thirteenth of September, which was broken off by the British ambassador rising to leave the room, declaring that unless satisfaction was given "the king would be obliged to take his measures for reinstating his injured subjects" and that the Spanish minister must understand that his refusal was the same as to "*sonner le tocsin de la guerre*", Grimaldi capitulated.⁷⁴ In the ambassador's presence a letter to the governor of Yucatan was drawn up reproving him for not having consulted the king previous to giving notice to the British logwood cutters to retire, ordering him to "re-establish them in the very same places they then were and to let them know that they may return to their occupation of cutting logwood without disquieting or disturbing them under

⁷² S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 6 August, 1764. "I cannot finish this letter without acquainting your Lordship with an anecdote that I learned from M. Grimaldi, that during the war the King of Spain had proposed to burn all the logwood trees in that part of the world to prevent all possible connection with us there; which scheme, though a wild one, proves how prepossessed they are of our people's carrying on an illicit trade under the pretence of cutting logwood."

⁷³ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 14 September, 1764.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* "At this part of the conversation I got up, and told him, I was sorry to find he stopped at such a trifle, but that unless satisfaction was given, the King would be obliged to take his measures for reinstating his injured subjects, and he must see that this would be the same thing as to *sonner le tocsin de la guerre*. Vous avez raison, dit-il, et j'atteste Dieu que je ferai tout ce qui depend de moi pour l'éviter."

any pretence whatever".⁷⁵ The last three lines of the document were written by Rochford himself.⁷⁶ The ambassador's further demand for reparation was declared by Grimaldi to be "a little too imperious". The Spanish minister declared that he "had not yet, because he dared not, propose it to the king".⁷⁷ Again and again in the following months Rochford returned to this part of his instructions, but was always met with a refusal and the statement that the king had already done more than could reasonably have been expected.⁷⁸ On one occasion Grimaldi remarked to the ambassador: "You do not know what a master I have to deal with, when he has once taken a resolution there is nothing can make him alter, especially as he is persuaded your demand is unjust and unreasonable, and that compliance with it would give room for a further extension of the seventeenth article of the Definitive Treaty".⁷⁹ Ultimately the logwood cutters' claims for damages, amounting to 27,097 pounds, 8 shillings, and 5 pence, had to be allowed to join the long list of unsatisfied but dormant claims of British subjects against members of the Spanish dominions.

That the British government was on the whole highly pleased with the outcome of the controversy was made clear in a letter from the secretary of state to the diplomat in whose hands negotiations had rested. "The Government", wrote Halifax, "had already gained the essential objects of His Majesty's

⁷⁵ S. P. Spain 168. Order from Don Julian de Arriaga to the Governor of Yucatan, 16 September, 1764, sent by Grimaldi to Rochford, 17 September, 1764, and enclosed by the ambassador to Halifax in his letter which had been begun on 14 September, 1764. *Cf. also Ibid.* Rochford to Halifax, 27 October, 1764. In the course of an interview on the eighteenth Grimaldi informed the ambassador, "We are so jealously inclined and so determined to have no more disputes with you that besides the duplicate I gave you for the Governor of Yucatan I have by express orders in a private letter directed him that in case the English ever do anything illegal not to oppose them but to represent it first to the court that H. M. might judge himself of the affair before any steps are taken."

⁷⁶ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 14 September, 1764. "Grimaldi then took the pen and drew up the form of the letter he would write immediately to the Governor of Yucatan . . . after altering some facts of the letter and adding the last three lines myself we were so far agreed."

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 27 October, 1764.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* Rochford to Halifax, 17 December, 1764.

demands. The conduct of the Governor was disavowed. The re-establishment of the logwood cutters in the several places from whence they had been expelled was granted, and the Spanish ministers had both agreed to admit the stipulation of the Treaty in its fair and genuine sense and to allow that His Majesty's subjects are not to be molested in their occupation of cutting logwood in the Bay of Honduras and in other places of the territory of Spain in that part of the world."⁸⁰ As for the unsatisfied reparations claim it served the British ambassador excellently well when the Spanish minister renewed the subject of a definition of boundaries in connection with Article seventeen.⁸¹

In the meantime the British government took energetic steps to render effective the order secured with so much difficulty, Sir William Burnaby, in command of the naval forces at Jamaica, was ordered to proceed in person to the Bay of Honduras, deliver the order to the governor of Yucatan and see that the logwood cutters were reinstated.⁸² Accompanied by vessels of war and some four hundred soldiers, Burnaby arrived in the Bay of Honduras in March, 1765, and was able by the twenty-sixth of the month to report that agreeable to orders the cutters had been given possession "in form" of the Río Hondo, Río Nuevo, and all the places from whence they had been driven by the commandant at Bacalar, and were now "perfectly satisfied". Don Felipe Ramírez de Estenos, the governor of Yucatan who had caused all the trouble, was dead and his successor professed the greatest regard for his Britannic majesty's subjects. In these circumstances, the escorting war vessels were sent back to Jamaica,

⁸⁰ S. P. Spain 168. Halifax to Rochford, 5 October, 1764.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* Halifax to Rochford, 27 October, 1764. "As soon as he [Grimaldi] saw me he said, 'I hope you will not think of mentioning your reparation of damages any more. I see plainly by Prince Masserano's letter that your ministers have still further views, for although they had some faint pretences for refusing to treat about settling limits where you were to go in the Bay of Honduras and that Part of the World before we complied with what you demanded, why is Lord Halifax now silent?' He said a good deal more in the same peevish stile,—that we were an enterprising nation and had extended views of commerce which could not be borne. I pointed out that the demand for the reparation of damages yet remained uncomplied with". Halifax replied to this, 23 November, 1764.

⁸² S. P. Spain 168. Halifax to Rochford, 5 October, 1764.

the cutters being promised, however, that from time to time one should be sent to inquire into the state of the settlement.⁸³

Until the declaration of hostilities in 1779, no further attempt was made by the Spaniards to drive the logwood cutters from Honduras Bay. The worst inconvenience they suffered from the proximity of the Spanish settlements was the constant loss of negro slaves through the encouragement given to them to desert to Spanish territory from whence it was found impossible to extract them. Every request for their return was met with the excuse that orders from the king of Spain commanded his servants in the New World to give protection to all who came to embrace the Roman Catholic religion. In 1768, it was asserted that boats for the purpose of assisting slaves to escape were kept constantly plying at the mouth of the Río Hondo from whence the slaves were sent to the commandant of Bacalar who transferred them to the governor at Marida.⁸⁴

The chief troubles, however, of the baymen after their re-establishment in 1765, came from internal disorders caused by the lack of an adequate system of government. Sir William Burnaby had remained with them through the spring and summer of 1765, and had drawn up a code of regulations for the government of life at the bay, but laws without provisions for enforcing

⁸³ Ad. I, 238. Sir William Burnaby to Mr. Stephens, on board the *Active* off the River Baliz in the Bay of Honduras, 26 March, 1765, enclosing a translation of a letter from the Governor of Yucatan, Joseph Alvarez, to Sir William Burnaby, 5 March, 1765.

⁸⁴ S. P. Spain 180. "Memorial of Allan Auld of London, Merchant, and trading in the Bay of Honduras for self and on behalf of his correspondents, settlers there." (Copy sent to Gray, 22 July, 1768.) "The present Spanish governor and his commandant in those parts continue to shew the same inamicable disposition toward the British settlers there as the other governors already complained of did. The Spaniards exert their utmost skill and attentions in seducing the negroes of H. M. subjects into their power, and for this purpose keep boats constantly plying at the mouth of the Río Hondo from whence they send them as they come to hand to the Commandant of Bacalar who transports them to the Governor at Marida, where they remain lost forever to their true and proper owners. . . . Matters are come to this miserable pass that at the time of writing these last despatches, 23 British negroes armed had gone off from the New River to the Spaniards and many more are expected to follow them, all H. M.'s subjects there being reduced to the last necessity of protecting their houses from being plundered and themselves from being slain."

them were found to be of little use, and the governor of Jamaica, within a few months of Burnaby's departure, was petitioned to provide some system of civil government. Lyttleton believed that this involved the exercise of greater rights than the British crown possessed, but forwarded the request to England. The advocate general, some months later, gave it as his opinion that "some sort of territorial right had been acquired by Great Britain at the Bay by the seventeenth Article of the Treaty of Paris sufficient to enable her to maintain and exercise civil jurisdiction over her subjects there".⁸⁵ Even after this pronouncement no political agent or minister on behalf of the crown was appointed nor even an efficient police system established.⁸⁶ The inhabitants also failed to be able to secure the constant presence of a ship of war in the harbor. The result was perpetual internal disturbance, frequent disorders among the visiting merchant ships, and losses from the Spaniards who seduced their negroes and "robbed them at pleasure of their fishing and turtling vessels". These conditions remained much the same until on the outbreak of war, in 1779, the unorganized and helpless settlement fell an easy prey to the Spaniards who carried into wretched captivity at Havana many of the settlers whom fourteen years earlier they had been forced to restore ceremoniously to their cuttings. For the next five years his majesty's settlement in Honduras Bay was hardly in existence.

⁸⁵ C O 123. Case of settlers of the Bay of Honduras referred to H. M. Advocate General, 21 April, 1766.

⁸⁶ C O 123, II. "Memorial of His Majesty's subjects captivated and plundered in Yucatan, and driven from the Bay of Honduras in September, 1779, to Lord North, London, 13 June, 1783." "On the reestablishment of H. M.'s subjects on the coast of Yucatan and in the Bay of Honduras agreeably to the Treaty of Paris, 1763, no attention given or care taken to appoint any sort of public agent or minister on behalf of the crown, who might have prevented or obtained immediate redress for many injuries done to and suffered by the inhabitants and have prevented any real or pretended offences given to the Spaniards. As little attention was given to the establishment of any kind of government by which the authority of the magistrate and the influence of the laws might have restrained the disorders of the licentious and given security to persons of property, from this neglect it happened that your memorialists suffered numberless indignities and losses from the Spaniards seducing their negroes and robbing them at pleasure of their fishing and turtling vessels."

In West Florida, the only other British settlement in America that marched on Spanish territory, treaty rights did not come into serious dispute until 1769. As long as Louisiana remained under the mixed French and Spanish provisional administration of Aubry and Ulloa, while both Spanish and English neighbors complained of the prevalence of clandestine trade and of refuge given by the others to deserters, on the whole a certain tolerance of each other prevailed.⁸⁷ Only a few score of soldiers were maintained in either province.⁸⁸ In Louisiana, English merchants were permitted to reside in New Orleans, a certain number of imports from the English seaboard continued to be admitted as in the days of purely French government, and no serious attempt was made to interfere with England's right under the Treaty to navigate the waters of the Mississippi on equal terms with the French.

The mere appearance, in August 1769, of General O'Reilly attended by three thousand men, in a part of the world where soldiers were counted at the most in hundreds, created almost as much consternation in the neighboring English settlement as among the French rebels of Louisiana.⁸⁹ Governor Browne applied immediately to General Gage for a further reinforcement

⁸⁷ C O 5, 241. Hillsborough to Major General Gage, 11 June, 1768.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 13 May, 1769. Hillsborough, secretary of state in charge of American affairs, in a letter to Major General Gage, approved of the force in West Florida consisting of six companies "which you represent to be a force sufficient for the defence of it".

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* Hillsborough to Gage, 9 December, 1769. "Advices received through various channels of the arrival at New Orleans of a force so greatly exceeding what the object seemed to require, the negotiation and correspondence carried on with the Creek Indians from the Havana, the naval preparations at the port and the augmentation of their troops there greatly beyond the usual peace establishment are circumstances which combined with other intelligence, make it necessary to give particular attention to the security of those parts most exposed to insult or attack. The situation of West Florida particularly answers this description. The merchants concerned in trade thither and other persons interested in improvements in the colony have expressed great apprehensions. . . . H. M. considers a greater force required for its protection than is at present stationed there. . . . Lose no time in sending thither such a number of troops and putting forts in such a state of defence as you shall think sufficient to discourage or disappoint any sudden attempt to distress and break up our infant settlements."

of troops,⁹⁰ and an officer reported on the most suitable steps to be taken for strengthening the defenses of Pensacola and Mobile.⁹¹ The first weeks of the new governor's administration brought convincing evidence that he proposed that the intercourse permitted under Ulloa and Aubry should be replaced by the exclusive system that prevailed throughout the rest of Spanish America. While forts on the Spanish bank of the Mississippi were strengthened, orders forbade the further importation of English colonial goods, and British merchants were prohibited from residing in New Orleans.⁹² As for the British right of navigating the boundary river the Spanish general meant that this right in the future should bear a narrower construction than it had in the past. An English engineer, passing in September, 1769, up the river under commission from the governor of West Florida to visit the English forts on its eastern bank, met with treatment designed to impress all Englishmen with the limitations of Article seventeen. Not only was the officer forbidden to set foot on shore at New Orleans to secure the usual provisions for his journey, but his vessel was cut loose from its moorings by a company of Spanish soldiers, under orders from the governor who declared that while the English might navigate the waters of the river they would not be allowed to attach so much as a line to the Spanish shore. To the engineer's protest that as "warping and tacking" was the only practical method of navigating the river his order in practice deprived the English of a right guaran-

⁹⁰ S. P. Spain 183. Extract from Lt. Governor Browne to the Earl of Hillsborough, Pensacola, 8 October, 1769, enclosed by Hillsborough to Weymouth, 23 Jan., 1770. "I took the first opportunity after I was informed of Count O'Reilly's arrival . . . of writing General Gage hoping that a reinforcement of troops will not be long retarded. I really think, my Lord, it is now expedient to reestablish posts on the Mississippi and Iberville, to protect those already settled, and to encourage others to settle and to have a strict eye on Spanish manoeuvres." One regiment and a company of artillery was Gage's reply to the appeal for extra troops. C O 5. 80. Gage to Hillsborough, 24 April, 1770.

⁹¹ C O 5. 80. Gage to Hillsborough, 18 August, 1770.

⁹² *Ibid.* 88. Gage to Hillsborough, New York, 4 December, 1769. "We are informed that Count O'Reilly is very assiduous to prevent any foreign commodities getting into Louisiana hoping to keep the trade of the province entirely in the hands of Spain, and that he will not suffer the English or any other foreigners to reside at New Orleans in the manner they have done hitherto."

teed by treaty, O'Reilly paid no heed further than to repeat his resolutions in a letter to Governor Browne.⁹³ A protest to the Spanish court against O'Reilly's behavior on this occasion secured no satisfaction. Grimaldi expressed surprise that the English government should complain of the "mild and temperate" conduct of the Spanish general. The Spanish, not the British, government had reason to complain of the incident. On their part, he assured the British representative, the treaty should be "rigidly observed".⁹⁴

As long as O'Reilly remained in America, alarms followed each other in rapid succession. His relations with the Indians created the utmost apprehension in Florida. Governor Browne, writing to the secretary of state in October, 1769, of a rumor that O'Reilly was to meet the Creek Indians in a great congress, declared that the Spanish governor's conduct indicated a purpose of "corrupting all the Indians surrounding us and by this means driving us from the Gulf of Mexico". Since his arrival, the red men were "insolent, dissatisfied, and mischievous beyond measure".⁹⁵ The fear of a congress proved to be groundless,⁹⁶ but it was with a sigh of relief that the English in West Florida heard in the spring of 1770 that General O'Reilly considered his province quiet enough to be left in the hands of others.⁹⁷ After his departure and the reduction of the military forces of Louisiana to five hundred and sixty-two men excessive alarm gradually subsided, although it was still thought necessary to keep a regiment at Pensacola, and give that coast the protection of occasional

⁹³ S. P. Spain 183. Campbell to Lt. Gov. Browne, Pensacola, 9 October, 1769, enclosed by Hillsborough to Weymouth, 23 January, 1770. A long despatch giving a full account of his journey.

S. P. Spain 183. Alexander O'Reilly to Governor Browne, 24 September, 1769, enclosed by Hillsborough to Weymouth, 23 January, 1770. In this letter O'Reilly stated that he was not opposed to free navigation but that the English were not allowed to "anchor in port or to cross plank on shore without the governor's permission". Enclosed by Weymouth to Harris, 2 Feb., 1770.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* Harris to Weymouth, 8 March, 1770.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* Lt. Gov. Browne to the Earl of Hillsborough, 8 Oct., 1769.

⁹⁶ S. P. Spain 184. Extract from a letter of Governor Grant to the Earl of Hillsborough, St. Augustine, 27 March, 1770, enclosed by Hillsborough to Weymouth, 14 June, 1770.

⁹⁷ C O 5. 88. Gage to Hillsborough, 24 April, 1770.

visits of ships from Jamaica. The relations of the Spaniards with the Indians remained a permanent source of anxiety, while any crisis in the correspondence of the two courts suggested the possibility of attacks on Pensacola and Mobile, and increased the suspicious watchfulness with which the two nations regarded each other from their forts on opposite sides of the Mississippi.⁹⁸

The island inhabitants of Spain and Great Britain in America had fewer occasions of crossing each others' paths than had those living on adjoining territories on the continent, but, wherever islands of the two nations closely approached each other, disputes were of common occurrence. The most persistent of these centered about the loss of slaves from the British to the Spanish territories, an evil which went to greater lengths among the West Indian Islands than anywhere else in America. Year after year, letters and petitions poured into the office of the British secretary of state in charge of colonial affairs, complaining of the encouragement given by inhabitants and officials of the Spanish islands to deserting negroes and on occasions of the capture of other negroes by raiding bands of Spaniards. Nearly all the British islands were affected at times, but the most frequent sufferers were Jamaica and the Virgin Islands because of their proximity to Cuba and Porto Rico.⁹⁹ In March 1767, the agent of Jamaica wrote to the Earl of Shelburne that "for some time past inhabitants of the Island of Cuba have carried off against their will many slaves from the north side of the island of Jamaica and that many others through the hopes of freedom have deserted and made their escape to Cuba". The inhabitants of the north coast, the writer said, had been driven to institute a patrol of militia which on several parts of the coast was kept on

⁹⁸ C O 5. 241. Cf. the "most secret and confidential" circular sent by Hillsborough to the governors in North America and the West Indies and the special letter to Gage, 28 September, 1770, apprising the governors and the military chiefs of the Spanish attack on the Falkland Island, and the consequent necessity of guarding against surprise attacks by the Spaniards especially along the Mississippi.

⁹⁹ S. P. Spain 178. Shelburne to Sir James Gray, 1 December, 1767.

S. P. Spain 179. Office of Gray to Grimaldi, 7 January, 1768, enclosed by Gray to Shelburne, 7 January, 1768.

guard all night in an effort to put a stop to these pernicious practices. Despite utmost efforts, however, the loss was continuous and enormous. The usual custom of escaping slaves was to seize a boat or canoe about ten or eleven at night, and with the assistance of the land current to get out of sight before daylight and arrive before the following night in Cuba "where they are not only well received, but even concealed when demanded". The number of slaves lost from the north side of Jamaica between July, 1766, and March, 1767, the agent reported, reached the total of ninety-five, "each worth at least one hundred pounds current money of Jamaica".¹⁰⁰

Not only the British but the Danes¹⁰¹ and the Dutch¹⁰² complained of the difficulty of keeping their negroes out of the hands of their Spanish neighbors who found the king's *cedula* enjoining protection to incipient Roman Catholics an elastic excuse for providing themselves with the workers it had grown difficult to secure in a legitimate manner.¹⁰³ In 1767, Denmark succeeded in securing from the Spanish court a *cartel* for the mutual restitution of slaves between the Danish West Indies and Porto Rico.¹⁰⁴ When the British ambassador pressed for a like convention he was told by Grimaldi that the precedent could not be followed partly because the agreement with Denmark stipulated that there should be a public Catholic chapel established in the Danish colony for converted negroes, and the council of the

¹⁰⁰ S. P. Spain 177. Memorial of Stephen Fuller, agent for the Island of Jamaica, to the Earl of Shelburne, 9 March, 1767, enclosing a letter from Thomas Gordon to Fuller, 4 March, 1767 (among the papers given to Sir James Gray on his departure for Madrid).

¹⁰¹ S. P. Spain 178. Shelburne to Gray, 1 December, 1767.

¹⁰² S. P. Spain 180. Gray to Weymouth, 24 November, 1768. "M. Doublet lately made by order a strong representation in writing upon the great injury done to their settlement at Caracao by the seduction of their negroes."

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* Gray to Shelburne, 13 October, 1768. "They are in the greatest want of negroes and can only be supplied by our means, a very advantageous project offered by some English merchants has been lately rejected on that principle (their determined system to exclude us from all possible communication with their possessions in America)".

¹⁰⁴ S. P. Spain 178. Shelburne to Gray, 1 December, 1767. "We are well assured of a cartel for the mutual restitution of slaves between the Danish Islands and Porto Rico having been signed at Madrid in June last."

Indies would not waive this demand in the case of Britain, and secondly because the advantages would not be reciprocal.¹⁰⁵ When urged further the Spanish minister openly declared that the two cases were different. They would not "find their *convenance*" in a *cartel* with Great Britain,¹⁰⁶ whereas in an agreement with Denmark the advantage was entirely on the side of Spain, especially as a convention with such an inferior power could be easily broken.¹⁰⁷ The British secretary of state might write of "the improbability of the two courts ever coming to a right understanding while M. de Grimaldi confines his views entirely to the advantages of his master's subjects without considering the justice which is due to other nations" and that the English government "was entitled to expect Spain to agree to a fair *cartel*", but no such agreement could be secured, and throughout the interval between the two wars the constant renewal of this complaint did much to prevent the growth of cordiality between the two nations.¹⁰⁸

When reproached by the British ambassador for pursuing an entirely selfish policy in refusing to come to some agreement in the matter of deserting slaves the Spanish minister on one occasion replied that the English were "guilty of a more unjustifiable practice in the enormous contraband they carried on in those

¹⁰⁵ S. P. Spain 179. Office of Gray, 10 March, 1768, in Gray to Shelburne, 14 March, 1768; and Gray to Shelburne, 14 March, 1768. "There was also another objection, to such an agreement—the advantage was not equal, our negroes [British] and deserters being more numerous, and for this reason he [Grimaldi] had always declined making a cartel with France for restoring deserters."

¹⁰⁶ S. P. Spain 180. Gray to Shelburne, 11 August, 1768. "The restitution of deserting slaves [Grimaldi said] was contrary to the ordonnances and usages of the Indies; that according to the law of nations and the general justice in Europe we are not founded in reclaiming them either as *Res* or *Personae* without an express stipulation. He owned he was against making a cartel as they should not find their convenance in it, our slaves being more numerous than theirs, that in all such agreements the advantages should be equal to both."

¹⁰⁷ S. P. Spain 180. Gray to Weymouth, 24 November, 1768. "I am almost ashamed to mention the reasons given for having made the Convention with Denmark, such as the advantage of the bargain being entirely on the side of Spain and that whenever it should prove otherwise they could easily break it—with such an inferior power."

¹⁰⁸ S. P. Spain 185. Weymouth to Harris, 7 September, 1770.

parts".¹⁰⁹ That this grievance, offered so often in the following years in extenuation of Spanish excesses in the New World, was not an imaginary ill but one founded on actual conditions the whole correspondence of the period bears witness. The English were, as Grimaldi accused them of being, "a very enterprising nation with extensive views of commerce",¹¹⁰ which were utterly opposed to, and, if carried into effect, completely fatal to the monopolistic basis on which the Spanish empire rested. Spain, to be sure, was not alone in cherishing monopolistic principles for the regulation of the relations of her overseas dominions; all other colonial powers of the period had the same views. The treaty which excluded English vessels from trading in Spanish colonial harbors equally closed English ports to Spanish ships. But, while the theory was common to the whole world, nowhere was the attempt made to enforce it in so pure a form as in the Spanish dominions. In places where the pressure for a more liberal system was greatest, other nations winked at evasions of the general rule that trade should be carried on exclusively with the mother country, or availed themselves of the privilege of granting special trading concessions to other nations; but Spain, in the second half of the eighteenth century, which was not to close until another nation pursuing a more liberal policy had lost half an empire on the issue, evinced as firm a determination to pursue the old theory in undiluted form as if it were in its first youth. By 1763, the task had narrowed itself largely into a question of keeping the English out of Spanish American harbors. The government at Madrid was well aware that the difficulty of this undertaking which had been a heavy burden since the discovery of the New World would be found increased a thousandfold by conditions created by the Seven Years' War.

The basic instrument regulating Anglo-Spanish relations in the New World was the American Treaty of 1670, which had been constantly confirmed in succeeding peaces and recently renewed in the Treaty of Paris. Articles 8, 9, and 10, were its most important clauses. Article 8 declared that "subjects and

¹⁰⁹ S. P. Spain 181, Gray to Weymouth, 20 March, 1769.

¹¹⁰ S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 27 October, 1764.

inhabitants, merchants, captains, masters of ships and mariners of the two kingdoms, provinces and dominions of each confederate respectively shall abstain and forbear to trade in the ports and havens which have forts, castles, magazines, or warehouses, and in all other places whatsoever possessed by the other party in the West Indies". Article 9 provided that either king might grant special trading privileges in his own dominions to the other. Article 10 read, "It is also agreed that in case the subjects and inhabitants of either of the confederates with their shipping (whether public and of war, or private and of merchants) be forced at any time, through stress of weather, pursuit of pirates and enemies, or other inconvenience whatsoever for the sake of shelter and harbour, to retreat and enter into any of the rivers, creeks, havens, roads, and ports belonging to the other in America, they shall be received and treated there with all humanity and kindness, and enjoy all friendly protection and help; and it shall be lawful for them to refresh and provide themselves, at reasonable and the usual rates with victuals and all things needful for the sustenance of their persons or reparation of their ships and conveniency of their voyage, and they shall in no manner be detained or hindered from retiring out of said ports, but shall remove and depart when and whither they please without let or hindrance". Needless to say, the Spaniards emphasized the importance of Article 8, whereas the English professed to find the true "*raison d'être*" of the treaty in Article 10. Immediately upon the conclusion of peace in 1763 each party set out to put into practice its own interpretation of national rights.

The English war vessels, whose connection with national trade interests was much more intimate in the eighteenth century than under modern conditions, were the first to experience the results of Spain's strengthened determination to exclude the English from all possible communication with her possessions in America. Sir William Burnaby in command of the Jamaica squadron reported to the admiralty in December, 1764: "At Havana they will hardly admit any of His Majesty's ships to enter, the Governor is continuously signifying his uneasiness at their remaining, that it gives offence to the court of Spain and it

is with great difficulty they suffer any of our people to land. At Cartagena and Porto Bello they meet with like difficulties."¹¹¹ Detailed accounts of individual cases of severity rapidly accumulated. One of the earliest was from Captain William Locker of the *Nautilus*. Bearing despatches from the admiral at Jamaica for the viceroy of Mexico, Locker put into Vera Cruz on the twenty-second of November, 1764. At the entrance to the harbor he was met by a Spanish officer who desired him to put to sea immediately. On disregarding this order and on anchoring in the harbor he was visited by a second officer who bore a verbal message from the governor to say that the despatches which he carried were to be handed to the messenger and that he was to quit the port early the next morning; if he persisted in waiting for an answer from the viceroy the castle would have instructions to fire upon his vessel and admittance to the shore or to the ships in the harbor would be refused to any officers or men leaving the sinking vessel. The English officer returned the reply that he must have a written request from the governor for the despatches and that he would remain for the viceroy's answer unless he were furnished with a written statement of the Spanish governor's determination to fire into the king's ship. When these papers had been delivered to him and weather conditions were to his liking the captain quitted the harbor, having been in it four days.¹¹²

Though usually meeting with receptions no more cordial than that accorded the *Nautilus* at Vera Cruz, and their officers rarely allowed to land, British war vessels continued to haunt Spanish American harbors, at times on the plea of bringing despatches for the governor, at others on the excuse of pressing need for fresh provisions. At Havana it was finally decided to teach the warships a lesson and on the appearance of the *Cygnets* and the *Adventure* in June, 1767, bearing despatches from Admiral Parry, the two vessels, on the excuse that they did not cast anchor

¹¹¹ Admiralty Papers, I, 338. Burnaby to Stephens, 21 December, 1764.

¹¹² Admiralty Papers I, 338. Proceedings of H. M.'s frigate *Nautilus*, Captain William Locker, commander, at La Vera Cruz between the 22 and 26 November 1764. Sent to the Admiralty by Burnaby, 21 September, 1765.

when ordered to, were actually fired at from the castle. Mutual complaints on the incident to both courts resulted in little satisfaction for either party. Grimaldi, when the governor's conduct was complained of, declared that it was high time a stop should be put to this abusive practice which ignored his Catholic majesty's rigorous command that no flag but his own should be allowed to enter Spanish American ports. In his opinion contraband trade was the real object of the visiting officers who would only rejoice if their activities should embroil the two courts. In this particular case under discussion he pointed out that the calmness of weather conditions made the excuse of necessity of no weight, while the despatches must have been mere pretexts to secure entrance since governors in America could not properly demand satisfaction of one another by sending messengers. With the mutual demand that the conduct of the respective servants in America should be enquired into, the affair of the *Cygnets* and the *Adventure* sank into the past without having affected any material change in theory or practice in America.¹¹³

The British warships in entering such important Spanish colonial harbors as Havana, Vera Cruz, and Porto Bello, had important objects in view quite apart from any profit to be derived from contraband trade, the opportunity for which was extremely limited in such well administered ports, and quite outside of the pleasure derived from over-riding Spanish regulations. In the first place, they undoubtedly hoped to build up a traditional right of entrance which would ensure them not only assistance in times of real necessity but furnish a constant means of keeping in touch with news of the Spanish American world and ascertaining

¹¹³ The following are the most important of the State Papers bearing on the incident:

S. P. Spain 178. Masserano to Shelburne, 19 September, 1767.

Ibid. Shelburne to Masserano, 26 Sept., 1767.

Ibid. Shelburne to Gray, with enclosures, 16 Sept., 1767.

Ibid. Gray to Shelburne, with enclosures, 7 Nov., 1767.

Ibid. Grimaldi to Gray, 5 Nov., 1767.

Ibid. Shelburne to Gray, secret and special, 4 Dec., 1767.

S. P. Spain 179. Admiralty to Shelburne, with enclosures, 28 April, 1768.

the strength and location of Spanish American forces.¹¹⁴ Secondly, they wished to keep visibly before the Spanish mind the neighboring presence of a British force whose business it was to watch over all the interests of British subjects in that part of the world. It was thought that the Spanish governors were more likely to maintain proper relations with their neighbors if held immediately responsible for their actions than if they had only to fear the consequences of complaints made by the long roundabout diplomatic path. The despatches carried to Spanish American harbors by British warships had a more serious mission to perform than merely to furnish, as Grimaldi suggested, an excuse for the vessels to enter forbidden ports.

The great volume of the contraband trade was carried on in places less important than the great harbors in which the warships had their most exciting experiences and in general followed devious and indirect paths. Aware of the existence of this trade, the Spanish government could only occasionally secure sufficiently clear evidence of it to compel the attention of the British ministry. There was one of these rare occurrences in 1769. In December of that year, to the great embarrassment of Lord Weymouth, the Spanish Ambassador produced a pass¹¹⁵ signed by Governor

¹¹⁴ Ad. I 238. Sir William Burnaby to Mr. Stephens, 21 December, 1764. "I have received by H. M.'s sloop 'Wolf' your letter of the twenty-ninth September, signifying their Lordships' directions that I should inform myself in the best manner I shall be able of the present state of the dominions belonging to the French and Spanish in the neighborhood of my command with respect to sea and land forces there, the state of their fortifications, etc. In answer to which I beg you to inform their Lordships that I give it in orders to the captains of H. M.'s ships and vessels which I send to the ports of either of those powers or to cruise on their coasts; to make a diligent enquiry into most of the particulars mentioned in your said letter so far as may be practicable, taking care not to give offense to the Government of the Place where they happen to be. . . ."

¹¹⁵ S. P. Spain 182. Weymouth to Hillsborough, 7 December, 1769. Melville's pass reads:

Seal of Grenada

"By His Excellency Robert Melville, Esq., Captain General and Governor in chief in and over the Southern Caribbee Islands of Grenada, The Grenadines, Domencia, St. Vincent and Tobago in America, and all other islands adjacent there unto, which are now or heretofore have been dependent thereupon, Chancellor, Ordinary and Vice-Admiral of the same, and Major General of H. M.'s forces in the West Indies. . . ."

Melville of Grenada for a certain English trading sloop to sail for the Spanish Main, and at the same time handed him two custom house certificates¹¹⁶ signed by other officials of the same island, one of which specified the cargo of the sloop in question and the other related to a schooner bound for the same unlawful goal. In reply to the urgent appeal of the secretary of state for some suggestion as to what he thought "might soften this matter", the Earl of Hillsborough could only offer the lame excuse that these certificates were merely formal permissions from the governor to sail out of the bay and were not meant to carry any authority in Spanish territory. They were signed in bulk

Permission is hereby granted unto Antony de Castro, Master or Commander of the sloop 'Speedwell', burthen fifty-four tons, or thereabouts, mounted with six guns, navigated with sixteen men, plantation built, and duly qualified to sail for the Spanish Main, he having entered and cleared his said vessel at the naval office, and all other H. M.'s officers in this place according to law, and for whom this shall be a sufficient Let-pass.

Given under my hand and seal of arms at St. George's this 29th day of August. 1769, and the seventh year of His Majesty's reign.

Robert Melville.

Passed the naval office.

App'd for Ch. Wilson

D. N. Officer.

By His Excellency's Command.

A. Symson".

¹¹⁶ S. P. Spain 182. Weymouth to Hillsborough, enclosure, 7 December, 1769.

"These are to certify all whom it doth concern that Francis, able master and commander of the schooner 'Resolution', burthen 70 tons or thereabouts, mounted with 10 guns. navigated with 12 men, . . . and bound for the Spanish Main hath here entered and cleared his said vessel, according to law, having on board 20 bales of dry goods, one saddle, and 3 new negroes. . . ."

Ibid. Enclosure.

"These are to certify to all whom it doth concern that Antony de Castro, master and commander of the sloop 'Speedwell', burthen 50 tons, . . . bound for the Spanish Main hath here loaded and taken on board 15 new negroes, 1 trunk of dry goods, and 4 iron boilers, . . . and hath here given bond. . . ."

Given under our hands and seal of office of the custom house, the twenty-ninth of August, 1767."

and filled in later.¹¹⁷ From this correspondence it appeared that Governor Melville had found the practice of issuing the certificates established in Grenada on his arrival in 1764, and as it agreed with that pursued in Antigua and the Leeward Islands, had continued it.¹¹⁸ The colonial secretary expressed the hope that "it would not be necessary to bring into further question the state of a commerce of the greatest importance to this kingdom, which has been ever since the date of the American Treaty carried on from Jamaica to Spanish ports in America by vessels clearing out of ports of that island with certificates of like nature."¹¹⁹

The character of the assistance given at times by the warships to illicit trade is made clear in a letter written in July, 1770, by the senior officer of his majesty's ship at Jamaica to the secretary of the admiralty. He reported that certain Messieurs Peter and Espret Barral and Co., whose house had charge of all the bullion imported into Jamaica, had represented "the favorable opportunity to open a communication with the rich province of Guatemala and this island" from which Great Britain would reap such great advantages "upon as firm a footing as the difficulties attending this sort of intercourse with the Spanish will admit of". The merchants were asking to have a sloop "stationed off the River Maltena or Salt Creek while one of the house went there to fix this valuable branch of commerce".

¹¹⁷ S. P. Spain 183. Hillsborough to Weymouth, 16 March, 1770, enclosing a letter from Melville to Hillsborough, 12 February, 1770. ". . . . that being accounted mere papers of course, and of no other intent of use than to signify the governor's permission for sailing out of the bay or harbour . . . and only necessary to be produced in English settlements, these set papers printed and with requisite blanks were from time to time laid before me as Governor by my public secretary in order to be signed (and, for the sake of despatch usually not fewer than two or three dozens together) after which they were carried away and lodged at his office ready to be delivered out to the masters of ships who should apply for them."

¹¹⁸ S. P. Spain 183. Governor Melville to Hillsborough, 12 February, 1770. ". . . . From my arrival at Grenada in December 1764 and during my usual residence there till July 1768 the practice which had been established before my arrival and agreeable (as I was informed) to that in Antigua and the Leeward Islands for the signing and delivering out of these set passes, was always as follows:"

¹¹⁹ S. P. Spain 185. Captain Tonym to Mr. Stephens, 30 July, 1770, enclosed by Hillsborough to Weymouth, 28 September, 1770.

When it came to the ears of Lord Weymouth that "Captain Jackson had sailed in the *Druid* upon that service" he wrote to Hillsborough that he "must give it as his opinion that such a step is contrary to the treaty and therefore highly improper".¹²⁰ Here, as elsewhere, the English government refused to recognize openly the claims of illicit trade, preferring to leave its encouragement in the safe hands of all classes of its servants in the New World, whose actions could be disavowed and the official representatives of the nation left free to assure the Spanish government that his majesty's government had no part in the contraband trade and that it fully recognized Spain's right to use every means at its command to end it.

Spain, however, possessed, as the British government fully realized, utterly inadequate forces to compel respect for the system of exclusiveness that she wished to prevail throughout her enormously overgrown American dominions. One avenue open for the expression of her discontent with the situation she made full use of. Individuals who fell into her power in Spanish America who could be remotely suspected of being connected with the illicit traffic or punished before the world as offenders against the contraband law were treated with a cruelty that shocked the feelings even of eighteenth-century witnesses. Nothing so much distressed the English ambassadors in Spain as the hardships suffered by fellow countrymen through the failure of treaty stipulations to provide protection to British subjects who found themselves made prisoners in the New World.¹²¹ Mere presence in the territory of Spain in America was as a rule taken as conclusive proof that the individuals so found were engaged in contraband trade. The result, in an age when all vessels were sailing ships exposed to dangers of navigation now happily past, was that numerous English sailors whose only offense was their misfortune in being wrecked on Spanish American shores, found themselves undergoing punishment designed for the class of

¹²⁰ S. P. Spain 185. Weymouth to Hillsborough, 1 October, 1770.

¹²¹ S. P. Spain 183. Harris to Weymouth, 5 April, 1770. "I should be happy to receive any instructions from your Lordship to get these men enlarged and at the same time put an effectual stop to that inhuman and unlawful practice of confining British sailors in their gaols."

criminals for whom the Spanish had the least mercy.¹²² For true offenders against the contraband laws in America, international treaties did not give the same protection as was afforded to the same class of British lawbreakers in Europe. In Old Spain, according to treaty, British subjects taken in contraband, might suffer the confiscation of their vessels and cargo, but the persons of the master and crew, many of whom had probably little to do in determining the object of the voyage, could not be imprisoned. As the treaties relating to America were silent on this point, the Spanish government took the view that "accused smugglers were subject to the law of Spain".¹²³

In practice the custom was for captured British subjects to be in the first instance thrown into the colonial jails. Later, on a favorable opportunity, which usually did not occur until after months of the most rigorous confinement, during which bread and raiment could only be secured from charitable persons, those who had not attempted to escape or otherwise offended the colonial powers were sent in irons on Spanish vessels to Old Spain.¹²⁴ On

¹²² S. P. Spain 184. Harris to Weymouth, 9 July, 1770. General O'Reilly told Harris, the British chargé d'affaires, that the British prisoners in the vessels in which he had crossed from Havana to Spain "deserved compassion rather than imprisonment" yet these on their arrival were sent to jail.

¹²³ S. P. Spain 171. Rochford to Halifax, 1 July, 1765. "During my absence Mr. De Visne had applied for the release of ten English sailors who are prisoners in chains at Cadiz; they were taken in the Spanish West Indies carrying on a contraband trade, and I learned that M. Grimaldi had refused getting them released insisting that taken as smugglers they were subject to the laws of Spain. I must beg leave to observe that by Treaty the King's subjects detected in carrying on a contraband trade here in Old Spain are to be released though the ship and cargo are to be confiscated, but the treaties that relate to America are silent with regard to this point. What I thought I had a fair right to insist upon was, that at least since they were brought into Europe, there was no pretence for detaining them here".

Cf. S. P. Spain 179, office of Gray to Grimaldi, 30 December, 1767; *Ibid.* Gray to Shelburne, 7 January, 1768.

¹²⁴ S. P. Spain 184. Office of Harris to Grimaldi, 15 July, 1770; *Ibid.*, 183, Spry to the Admiralty, 13 March, 1770; *Ibid.*, 166, Rochford to Halifax, 3 April, 1764. If prisoners managed to make their escape to a British vessel of war they were afforded protection and occasionally incoming vessels which were thought to have British prisoners on board were stopped by British men of war and searched and any prisoners not thought to be felons were forcibly removed. *Cf.* Letters relating to the protection afforded to three British prisoners taken by

their arrival they were either confined in the jail at Cadiz, to await the final decision of the council of the Indies on their case, or were placed on vessels in the harbors and worked as slaves. *Autos* setting forth the nature of their crimes were supposed to be sent with them from America, but were frequently not transmitted until months had passed.

On information of the arrival of new British prisoners from America, the British ambassador at Madrid always solicited their immediate release. He based his request on the principle that the king's subjects could not be imprisoned in Europe for a crime which bore that penalty only in America. After further months of delay, frequently on the excuse that the *autos* were not yet received and so it was uncertain for what crime the prisoners were retained, as a favor from the Spanish to the British crown, the English subjects were finally released, although in some instances liberty was not secured until the victims had added to their colonial and Cadiz experiences a further ordeal at Ceuta where they were loaded with irons and worked as slaves.¹²⁵

Captain Hollwell of the British ship *Glory* from the Spanish trading vessel *Vigilantia* off Cape Vincent, in January, 1770. S. P. Spain 183. Hollwell to the admiralty office, 8 April, 1770, enclosed by the admiralty to Weymouth, the 11 April, 1770. "I did meet with the Spanish ship *Vigilantia* on the fourth of January last, and, when my lieutenant went on board her, three English distressed seamen came to him and asked my protection, telling him they were unfortunate men that had been cast away in the Bay of Campeacha, had fallen into the Spaniards' hands, were marched to La Vera Cruz, from thence sent to Havana, where they were imprisoned without receiving any subsistence but from the charity of negroes, and sent from thence when they were in want of seamen on board the *Vigilantia* to navigate her to Europe. Agreeable to my instructions I demanded these men. . . . "

¹²⁵ S. P. Spain 184. Office of Harris to Grimaldi, 15 July, 1770, enclosed by Harris to Weymouth, 19 July, 1770.

"Les plaintes que je reçois de Cadiz par rapport aux sujets du Roy, mon Maître, qui se trouvent dans les prisons publiques de cette ville sont si fréquentes et si bien fondées que je ne puis pas m'empêcher d'importuner Votre Excellence à cet égard. Avant d'entrer dans le détail du cas de ces malheureux qui m'engagent actuellement à m'adresser à Votre Excellence il ne sera pas hors de propos d'observer en général sur l'injustice de cette manière de procéder, également contraire à l'humanité et aux conventions puisque les traités n'autorisent pas la punition de nos sujets en Europe qui se sont rendus coupables en Amérique, et l'humanité puisque en général ils subissent des supplices fort au-dessus de leur crimes, c'est de quoi le malheureux Guillaume Reid avec ces trois matelots tous

Repeated remonstrances failed to effect any improvement. To the ambassador's insistence that crimes committed in America should be punished in America it was replied that the system in operation was more merciful; that the laws of the Indies were so severe in punishing contraband it was not thought proper to entrust the execution of them to the governors, the offenders were better off in Europe. To which reasoning Sir James Gray on one occasion returned the reply that "whatever the motive . . . the filling of prisons at Cadiz with British subjects had an odious appearance".¹²⁶ Mr. Harris wrote two years later that he could never get the imprisoned British sailors quite cleared. "They seem to wish," he remarked, "always to have one or two."¹²⁷ When six months later he was able to write that none were in confinement he felt that he had achieved a triumph as this "circumstance had not happened for several years".¹²⁸

Throughout the period surveyed in this chapter, Spain, in fournissent un exemple frappant, car après qu'ils eussent souffert un traitement le plus cruel à Cartagène en Amérique, on les transporta à Cadix où ayant resté plus d'une année dans un cachot ils furent envoyés à Ceuta où à présent ils se trouvent chargés des fers."

In enclosing a copy of his office to Weymouth, 19 July, 1770, Harris wrote, ". . . the poor wretches who gave rise to this last complaint were brought from the Havana on board the 'Pallas' frigate and it does not appear that they have been guilty of any crime; General O'Reilly who came over in the same sloop told me they deserved compassion rather than punishment, yet so strange and dilatory are the tribunals under the foundations of the Council of the Indies that they were immediately on their arrival sent to prison unheard and unquestioned."

¹²⁶ S. P. Spain 179. Gray to Shelburne, 12 May, 1768. Cf. S. P. Spain 179, office of Gray to Grimaldi, 30 December, 1767. "Je ne saurais me contenter de la raison alléguée pour continuer à déténir ces malheureux, ignorant par quelle autorité le Conseil des Indes peut s'arroger le droit d'emprisonner en Europe les sujets du Roy mon Maître . . . dont le seul crime est d'avoir eu le malheur d'être arrêtés injustement par les pirates en Amérique, et avoir perdu leurs navires et effets. . . ."

Cf. also S. P. Spain 179, Gray to Shelburne, 7 January, 1768. "I found it necessary . . . to take exception to the imprisonment of the King's subjects in Europe for supposed offenses done in America, where alone they ought to be punished for any crimes they may have committed; and it is upon this principle that His Majesty's ministers have always demanded their enlargement."

¹²⁷ S. P. Spain 183. Harris to Weymouth, 5 April, 1770.

¹²⁸ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 30 August, 1770.

her relations with England in America, stood everywhere on the defensive. In Central and North America, where continental boundaries were contiguous as in the cases of Mosquitia, Honduras Bay, and West Florida, as well as in the West Indies and on the seas, Spain endeavored to enforce, through the action of energetic, colonial governors, the narrowest construction of the terms of the treaties subsisting between the two Powers. In her anxiety to prohibit as far as possible all intercourse between the subjects of the two nations in America and to secure definite understandings and indisputable limits beyond which there could be no question of the English going, Spain was throughout the period willing to make considerable sacrifices of territory. The English, on the other hand, repeatedly refused to consider the replacement of the vague statements of treaties, which had proved themselves to be so well adapted to the process of peaceful encroachment, by new regulations, however advantageous on the surface these might appear to be. Rather than revise the old loosely-worded American Treaty or remake the vague phrases of the Treaty of Paris, England preferred to bear such measures of revenge as Spain could devise in the matters of the severe punishment of her subjects captured in the contraband trade and the continuous loss of slaves from her colonial possessions.

CHAPTER III

THE FALKLAND ISLANDS

“England that lives in the north of Europe and Spain that dwells in the south” wrote Walpole to Horace Mann in October, 1770, “are vehemently angry with one another about a morsel of rock that lies somewhere at the very bottom of America, for modern nations are too neighborly to quarrel about anything that lies so near them as in the same quarter of the globe. Pray, mind; we dethrone nabobs in the most northeast corner of the Indies; the Czarina sends a fleet from the Pole to besiege Constantinople; and Spain huffs and we arm, for one of the extremities of the southern hemisphere. It takes a twelvemonth for any one of us to arrive at our object, and almost another twelvemonth before we can learn what we have been about. Your patriarchs, who lived eight or nine hundred years, could afford to wait eighteen or twenty months for the post coming in, but it is too ridiculous in our post-diluvian circumstances. By next century, I suppose, we shall fight for the Dog Star and the Great Bear.”¹²⁹ The subject of these reflections, the Falkland Islands, whose disputed sovereignty had brought the two greatest colonial powers of the world to the very brink of war, had been among the minor discoveries of the sixteenth century. They had first been sighted by the English navigator, Captain John Davis, in 1592, and had been seen for a second time two years later, again by an English sailor, when Richard Hawkins sailed along their northern shores and in honor of his sovereign bestowed upon them the name of Hawkins’ Maiden Land.¹³⁰ In “the spacious days” of the Great

¹²⁹ *Letters of Sir Horace Walpole*, 4th Earl of Oxford. Ed., Peter Cunningham. Vol. V, p. 259, London, 1891.

¹³⁰ S. P. Spain, supplementary, 253. Egmont (John Perceval, 2nd Earl of Egmont, 1st lord of the admiralty, 10 Sept., 1763–Aug. 1766) to Grafton (secretary of state for the Northern Department), 20 July, 1765. “The first and second discoveries of this Island [Falkland’s] were both made, by the subjects and under

Queen, when no year passed without adding richly to man's geographical knowledge, the finding of a group of islands covering some five thousand square miles at the southern end of the New World naturally aroused very little interest. For a century and a half after their discovery, though seen and visited by many of the seamen whose calling took them into the south Atlantic, the Falkland Islands continued for the most part the same obscure

the authority of the crown of Great Britain in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and Charles II, and the French never saw them till in the reign of Queen Anne. Their present projector Frezier owns that they were first discovered by the English." In this letter Egmont enclosed a number of extracts from journals of voyages of discoveries. The following are drawn from the accounts of their experiences by Davis and Hawkins:

"Captain Davis of the *Desire*, one of the ships that sailed with Mr. Cavendish on his last voyage to the South Sea." Hakluyt, vol. 3, p. 846, printed in the year 1600. (Enclosed by Egmont to Grafton, 20 July, 1765).

"The seventh of August, 1592, towards night we departed from Penguin Isle [near Port Desire on the coast of Patagonia] shaping our course for the straights, where we had full confidence to meet our general. The ninth we had a sore storm, so that we were constrained to hull, for our sails were not to endure any force. The fourteenth we were driven in among certain Isles never before discovered by any known relation, lying 50 leagues or better from the shore east and northerly from the straights. In which place unless it had pleased God of his wonderful mercy to have ceased the wind we must of necessity have perished."

Sir Richard Hawkins, *Voyage to the South Seas*, pp. 69-70. Printed in the year 1622. "The second of February, 1593/4 about nine of the clock in the morning we discerned land which bore S. W. of us, which we looked not for so timely and coming nearer and nearer unto it, by the lying we could not conjecture what land it should be, for we were not next of anything in 48 degrees, and no platt or sea chart which we had made mention of any land which lay in that manner near about that height. In fine we brought our larboard tack on board and stood to the northeastward all the day and night, and the wind continuing westerly and a fair gale we continued our course along the coast the day and night following, in which time we made account we discovered land well near threescore leagues off the coast. It is bold and made small shew of dangers. The land is goodly champain country and peopled. We saw many fires, but could not come to speak with the people for the time of the year was far spent, to shoot the straights and the want of our pinnace disabled us for finding a port or road, not being discretion with a ship of charge, and in an unknown coast to come nearer the shore before it was sounded which were causes . . . that hindered the further discovery of this land with its secrets." [Here follows a detailed description of natural features which he saw, or thought he saw, from his ship.] He continues: "The land for that it was discovered in the reign of Queen Elizabeth my sovereign lady and mistress and a maiden queen, and at my cost and adventure, in a perpetual memory of her chastity and remembrance of my endeavours, I gave it the name of Hawkins' Maiden Land."

and deserted existence among the ocean mists which had been theirs since the beginning of time. On the maps of the world the new archipelago appeared under various names differing with the nationality of the mapmaker. The English called the group "Falkland Islands" from the name bestowed on the sound between the two main islands by John Strong in 1690.¹³¹ The

¹³¹ James Burney, *Chronological History of the Voyages and Discoveries in the South Sea or the Pacific Ocean*. Vol. IV, Part II, p. 329, London, 1816. Burney writes of Strong's expedition: "In the war between Great Britain and France, which ensued on the accession of William III and Mary to the British throne Spain being at the same time at war with France, some merchants in England joined in the equipment of a ship for the purpose of trading with the Spanish settlements in the South Sea. They obtained a commission from the Admiralty for their ship to cruise upon the French, which was granted with a proviso that the commander should keep an exact journal of his proceedings and transmit a copy of it to the commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of England. Another object was to search after a 'rich wreck or two at or near the Point of Santa Elena not far from the Bay of Puna and to endeavour to fish up some of the lost treasure.' "

"The *Welfare*, a ship of 270 tons" under the command of John Strong and with a crew of 90 men sailed from England, 1 Nov., 1689, and on January 27, 1690, came in sight of "Davis' Southern Islands". Strong describes his discovery of the sound between the two main islands. (Burney, *idem*, pp. 330, 331.) "On Latitude 51°3' S, Tuesday the 28th. This morning at four o'clock we saw a rock that lyeth from the main Island four or five leagues. It makes like a sail. At six we stood into a sound that lies about 20 leagues from the westernmost land we had seen. The sound lyeth south and north. There is 24 fathoms depth at the entrance which is 4 leagues wide. We came to an anchor six or seven leagues within, in 14 fathoms water. Here are many good harbors. We found fresh water in plenty, and killed abundance of geese and ducks. As for wood there is none." They remained in a harbor on the western side of the sound till the 31st, when they sailed on southward and found a clear passage to the open sea in that direction. "On the 31st in the morning we weighed from this harbor with the wind S.W.S. We sent our longboat ahead of the ship to sound before us. At eight o'clock in the evening we anchored in 9 fathoms. The next morning we weighed and sent our boat before us. At ten we were clear out of the sound. At twelve we set the West Cape bearing for N.E. which we named Cape Farewell. This Sound, Falkland Sound as I named it, is about 17 leagues long. The first entrance lies S. to E. and afterwards S. to W." Note by Burney, *idem*, IV., part II, p. 331. "It appears that the name of Falkland was given by Captain Strong to the Sound or Passage through which he sailed . . . and that he did not intend to disturb any name before given to the lands, which he calls in his journal Hawkins' Land. By some accident or misapprehension, however, the name Falkland has been adopted by the English for the general name of all these Islands." Strong's MS. "Journal" and Richard Simson's account of the voyage entitled "Observations made during a South Sea Voyage" are in the British Museum.

Dutch knew them as the Sebaldine Islands from the name of their first Dutch discoverer.¹³² The French called them Les Malouines, following the French explorers of the early eighteenth century who had wished to honor the enterprising port of St. Malo from which they had set sail. The Spaniards, nationalizing the French name, knew them as the Malvinas. But, while European recognition was in this way accorded the existence of the new islands, knowledge of natural conditions prevailing on them was almost wholly lacking. Explorers who mentioned them in the narratives of their adventures referred to their natural features vaguely or inaccurately, describing what they had seen during the short time their vessels had taken to replenish water supplies, or giving an account merely of what they had observed, as their ships plied along the shores on their way to the Horn.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century there appears to have been no project formed for establishing a settlement upon the Falkland Islands. Then in the year 1748, Lord Anson,¹³³ in his *Voyage Round the World in the Years 1740-1744*, set forth at some length the advantages which his experience suggested would flow from a British settlement upon islands so conveniently

¹³² Sebald de Wert, a Dutch navigator, visited the Falklands in 1598, being apparently the third European sailor to locate the group.

¹³³ George, Lord Anson (1697-1762). At the close of the year 1739, Anson (then captain) assumed command of a British squadron destined for the Pacific. His instructions were "to use your best endeavors to annoy and distress the Spaniards (against whom war had been declared on 19 Oct., 1739) either on sea or land to the utmost of your power, by taking, sinking, burning, or otherwise destroying all their ships and vessels that you shall meet with". He sailed with his six vessels on September 18, 1740. At the Horn he encountered heavy gales which cost him two of his vessels. On the Pacific he sacked the Spanish town of Païta and had the good fortune to succeed in capturing the annual Spanish galleon on its way from Acapulco to Manila with her treasure of a million and half dollars. After this exploit Anson circumnavigated the globe and returned to England in 1744, where he was shortly promoted to the rank of rear admiral and became one of the commissioners of the admiralty. During the Duke of Bedford's tenor of office as first lord of the admiralty (1744-1748) and later while the Earl of Sandwich held the same post (1748-1751) Anson acted as the real executive chief of this department of state. On the retirement of Sandwich from the office in 1751, Anson received the official appointment as first lord of the admiralty and continued to hold the office with the exception of an interval of a few months (Oct., 1756-July, 1757) until his death on June 6, 1762, being thus the head of the naval service through the greater part of the Seven Years' War.

situated in the very pathway which led to the "South Seas"—that happy hunting ground of eighteenth century adventurers. Like other English navigators before him Anson had experienced great inconvenience from having a full description of his expedition furnished by the Portuguese of St. Catherine's Island on the Brazilian coast, where he had been forced to stop for water, to the Spaniards of the Río de la Plata.¹³⁴ Considering the enormous contraband trade constantly carried on by the Portuguese with the Spaniards, Anson believed that any anchorage on the Brazilian coast would possess similar disadvantages involving an end to all hopes of capturing Spanish trading ships, as on the news of the presence of an enemy ship, Spanish navigation along the coast instantly stopped.¹³⁵ He therefore suggested that the Falklands and Pepys Island¹³⁶ should be surveyed by a ship especially fitted

¹³⁴ Anson, George. *A Voyage round the world in the year MDCCXL, I, II, III, IV*, Dublin, 1748, p. 47. ". . . we afterwards found by letters, which fell into our hands in the South Seas, that he (the Spanish governor of St. Catherine's) had dispatched an express to Buenos Ayres, where Pizarro (the Spanish Comodore who had been sent out from Spain with six vessels, five of them of the line, to intercept Anson on his way to the Horn) then lay, with an account of our squadron's arrival at St. Catherine's, together with the most ample and circumstantial intelligence of our force and condition. . . ."

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 73. ". . . The treatment we met with, and the small store of refreshments we could procure there (St. Catherine's) are sufficient reasons to render all ships for the future cautious, how they trust themselves in the government of Don Jose Silva de Paz; for they may certainly depend on having their strength, condition, and designs betrayed to the Spaniards, as far as the knowledge the Governor can procure of these particulars will give leave. And as this treacherous conduct is inspired by the views of private gain, in the illicit commerce carried on to the river Plate, rather than by any national affection which the Portuguese bear the Spaniards, the same perfidy may perhaps be expected from most of the governors of the Brazil coast, since these smuggling engagements are doubtless very extensive and general. . . . The Spanish trade in the South Seas running all in one track from north to south, with very little deviation to the eastward or westward, it is in the power of two or three cruisers properly stationed in different parts of this track, to possess themselves of every ship that puts to sea; but this is only so long as they can continue concealed from the neighbouring coast; for the instant an enemy is known to be in those seas, all navigation is stopped, and consequently all captures are at an end; since the Spaniards, . . . send expresses along the coast, and lay a general embargo on all their trade."

¹³⁶ Since Cowley's voyage of discovery in the South Atlantic in 1683 it had been believe that there existed in latitude 47°40' an island well furnished with the

out by the government for that purpose and the fact ascertained whether they were suitable for the establishment of a naval station at which ships bound for the South Seas could refresh themselves without their presence in the south Atlantic becoming known to the Spaniards. An anchorage so conveniently situated at a considerable distance from the continent and yet near the Horn would be, he thought, of "prodigious import". From it the Spanish trade along the South American coast could be easily preyed upon and Spain in time of war otherwise infinitely distressed.¹³⁷ To further the same patriotic purpose and to make still easier the path of British ships to the Pacific, Anson also urged that the whole coast of Patagonia especially on its western side, together with the shores of Tierra del Fuego and Staten Land, should be carefully surveyed with a view to discovering a convenient port for refreshment in the Pacific, nearer to the Falkland Islands than Juan Fernández,¹³⁸ the one then in use.

two great requisites of wood and water and admirably located as a place of refuge and refreshment for British vessels on the long and dangerous voyage to the Pacific. The finding of this island formed one of the objects of practically every English navigator for a hundred years after Cowley's "Journal" had described it in glowing terms to the world. It was not until repeated visits to the spot had failed to reveal the presence of an island that Pepys' Island ceased to figure on maps of the South Atlantic. The following passage from Byron's *Voyage round the World in H. M. ship Dolphin* (1767, pp. 77, 78) offers an explanation of the origin of the story. "It will not be improper here to take notice that as in most of the charts of Patagonia, an island is described by the name of Pepys Island, where travellers have asserted that they have seen trees in abundance and many rills of water, but that after several attempts in the latitude where it was said to be discovered no island nor any soundings could be found; in justice to the pretended discoverers of that and other imaginary islands, we ought to observe, that they had probably no intention to deceive; for on this coast where you meet with frequent gales of wind, and thick foggy weather, we found the banks of fog were apt to deceive even an accurate observer and make him mistake them for land. Thus we ourselves have frequently imagined that we saw land very near; but suddenly a breeze of wind springing up, our supposed land disappeared, though we did not think ourselves above a league and a half from it, and convinced us of our great mistake by opening to our view an unbounded prospect."

¹³⁷ Anson, George, *A Voyage round the World*, p. 78.

¹³⁸ Letter from Anti Oberus to Mr. Urban, *Gentleman's Magazine*, Dec., 1770. "At a proper season, which is December and January, it is little more than a month's sail from Falkland's Islands to the island of Juan Fernández in the south seas."

He recalled to the minds of his contemporaries that Charles II. had despatched Sir John Narborough to survey the Straits of Magellan and the neighboring coasts of Patagonia for the purpose of opening up friendly relations with the Chilean Indians "who were generally at war or at least on ill terms with their Spanish neighbors". This excellent project of the Stuart king, Lord Anson pointed out, had been unsuccessful from purely accidental causes and deserved to be renewed with all vigor.¹³⁹ With two such aids to navigation as these stepping-stones would provide, England, Lord Anson thought, could face with equanimity European competition in the Pacific.

In 1750, shortly after the return of peace between England and Spain as the result of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, Anson, equipped with paramount influence at the admiralty office, set about clothing the theories advanced in his book in practical form. Preparations were taken in hand to despatch some frigates to examine the Falkland Islands, and make discoveries in the South Seas. These activities were brought to a halt by remonstrances from the Spanish ambassador who made such strong representations against the project that for the sake of peace the government decided to put the matter to one side for the moment,¹⁴⁰ without acquiescing, however, in Spain's pretensions that the islands in question were merely an appanage of Patagonia, or that the Papal Bull of 1493 had conferred on her the right to

¹³⁹ Anson, George, *Voyage round the world*, pp. 78, 79, 80. "His [Narborough's] disappointment was merely accidental and his transactions on the coast . . . are rather an encouragement for future trials of this kind than an objection against them."

¹⁴⁰ S. P. France 271. Lord George Lennox to Shelburne, 17 Sept., 1766. "In a conversation I had last Sunday with the Duc de Choiseul he told me there were two subjects he wished to speak to me about. . . . The first, he said, related to Les Isles Malouines which Spain has claimed and obtained from France, in consequence of the Treaty of Utrecht as by it all but Spaniards are excluded from sailing in that part of the World, and England's having already observed the article of the treaty in laying aside, (as it is alleged) a project of Lord Anson's in the year 1751 for those seas on the representation of Mr. Wall, then minister from Spain in England, was given as a proof of the propriety of their demand"

all discoveries in the region.¹⁴¹ Here the matter stood until the close of the Seven Years' War.

With the Peace of Paris came a renewal of exploring activities in which the Falkland Islands became the object of two separate expeditions, both directly inspired by Anson's work. From England, the Earl of Egmont, Anson's successor as first lord of the admiralty, took up his predecessor's scheme and despatched Commodore Byron to the south Atlantic with orders "to proceed to His Majesty's Islands called Falklands' and Pepys's Islands, situate in the Atlantic Ocean near the Straits of Magellan, in order to make better surveys than had yet been made and to determine a place or places most proper for a new settlement or settlements thereon".¹⁴² After searching in vain for the mythical

¹⁴¹ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Egmont to Grafton, 20 July, 1765. "Your Grace and the rest of the King's servants will no doubt particularly consider how far and in what manner this project [that of establishing an English settlement on the Falklands] may commit Great Britain with the Spaniards or the French. First as to Spain, it is impossible that their pretended title from the Pope's Grant or any treaty (so far as I can recollect) can give them the least claim to an Island lying 80 or 100 leagues in the Atlantic ocean eastward of the continent of South America to which it cannot be deemed appurtenant . . . and the attempt of France to settle there seems to confirm this argument against all that can be urged by either of those powers to that effect. With respect to France the first and second discoveries of this Island were both made by the subjects and under the authority of the crown of Great Britain. . . ." Cf. note 130.

¹⁴² S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Conway to the lords of the admiralty, 20 July, 1765. The importance which Egmont attached to a settlement on the Falklands is clear from his letter to the Duke of Grafton, 20 July, 1765 (*idem*). "This station . . . is undoubtedly the key to the whole Pacific ocean. . . . This island must command the Ports of trade of Chile, Peru, Panama, Acapulco, and in one word all the Spanish territory in that sea. It will render all our expeditions to those parts most lucrative to ourselves, most fatal to Spain and no longer formidable, tedious, or uncertain in a future war, and the coast of Chile from the Straits of Magellan to the Isle of Chiloe is wholly savage and uninhabited by the Spaniards, and possessed by the most warlike of all the native Indians in perpetual hostility with Spain. This country abounding above all the rest in mines of gold and silver and the navigation through those Straits to Chiloe being now well known and such as seldom exceed a month Your Grace will presently perceive the prodigious use hereafter to be made of an establishment in this place by the nation who shall first fix a footing there. . . . "

Pepys' Island,¹⁴³ Byron in January, 1765,¹⁴⁴ reached an excellent anchorage in one of the smaller islands of the Falkland group, which he described as "one of the finest harbours in the world" and to which he gave the name of Port Egmont.¹⁴⁵ On the twenty-third of the same month after coasting the island above seventy leagues, he unfurled a union jack on one of the two main islands and "took possession of this country in form for His Majesty and his Heirs".¹⁴⁶ Although from the Falklands Byron continued his journey around the world, not returning to England until 1766, his work in the south Atlantic was at once followed up.

¹⁴³ Byron, *A Voyage round the World in the ship, The Dolphin*, London, 1767, p. 41. The island is spoken of as "laid down in our charts in the latitude of 48 degrees south, and in the longitude of 64 degrees from the meridian of London bearing east by south of Cape Blanco". Cowley named it in honor of Samuel Pepys, secretary to James, Duke of York, then lord high admiral of England. "All our endeavours were ineffectual and we were firmly persuaded of the impracticability of finding any such place".

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 69. Byron sighted the islands on January 13, and landed January 15.

¹⁴⁵ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Byron to Egmont, 24 Feb., 1765.

In Byron's account of his voyage, (*Voyage Round the World in H. M. ship, The Dolphin*, pp. 70, 71), he writes: "Port Egmont is surrounded by a range of islands perfectly disjoined, and each placed in a convenient and agreeable situation. There are three different passages into this port, one from the south-west, another from the north-east, and the third from the south-east, and this last we found capable of receiving a ship of the greatest burthen. This harbor is of such extent as to be able to receive the whole royal navy of England, which might lie in the greatest security."

The later settlement called Port Egmont is described as "situated on the south side of an island, named Saunders, from whence there was a view of the whole harbor called Port Egmont". Bernard Penrose, *An Account of the Last Expedition to Port Egmont, in Falkland's Islands in the year 1772*, London, 1775, p. 13.

¹⁴⁶ Byron, *A Voyage round the World in H. M. ship, The Dolphin*, p. 76. "On the 23rd January the commodore with the captains of the Dolphin and Tamer and the principal officers, went on shore to the above island, where the Union Jack was erected on a high staff, and being spread, the Commodore named the whole His Majesty's isles, which he claimed for the crown of Great Britain, his heirs and successors. The colors were no sooner spread than a salute was fired from the ship. They were very merry on the occasion, a large bowl of arrack punch being carried on shore, out of which they drank, among several loyal toasts, success to the discovery of so fine a harbor."

The storeship which the explorer had sent home from Port Famine with an account of his work at the Falklands reached England on June the twenty-first. Within a month the admiralty had received instructions that another "embarcation" was to be made "in order to carry into further execution the said settlement at Port Egmont upon the Falkland Islands". The new expedition, like the first, was to consist of three vessels, a frigate of thirty-two guns, a sloop, and a storeship. These were to be furnished with all the provisions and necessaries, especially a "wooden blockhouse ready framed" for the erection of a permanent settlement on the shores of Port Egmont. Twenty-five marines, including officers, were to constitute the defense force and were promised relief within the ensuing year. The commanding officer whose first duty was to complete the settlement "at all events" bore instructions how to proceed should he find any occupants on the islands. If the intruders were savages, they were to be treated kindly and won by gentle methods; if, on the other hand, "any lawless persons should happen to be found seated on any part of the said Islands" they were to be compelled either "to quit the said Island or to take the oath and acknowledge and submit themselves to His Majesty's Government as subjects of the Crown of Great Britain" and finally, "if, contrary to expectation, the subjects of any Foreign Power in amity with Great Britian should under any real or pretended authority have taken upon them to make any settlement of any kind or nature whatsoever upon any part or parts either of the said Falklands or Pepys Islands" the commander was to "visit such settlement and remonstrate against their proceedings acquainting them that the said Islands had been first discovered by the subjects of the Crown of England sent out by the Government thereof for that purpose and of right belong to His Majesty, and His Majesty having given orders for the settlement thereof the subjects of no other power can have any title to establish themselves without the King's permission". If they refused to depart within a limited time the English officer was "to avoid proceeding to measures of hostility" but to despatch a ship with

full information to England for assistance.¹⁴⁷ Captain John McBride, of H. M. Ship *Jason*, was appointed to command the expedition. Accompanied by the *Carcass* sloop and a storeship, *Experiment*, he left England in September, 1765, and sailing by way of the Madeira and Cape Verde Islands reached Port Egmont in the following January.¹⁴⁸

Before the southern winter closed in, Captain McBride sent home an account of his first three months on the Falklands.¹⁴⁹ This was far less favorable to the new settlement than Byron's report had been. Instead of expatiating on the advantages of "the finest harbour in the world", the beauties of a land "wanting nothing but wood", and the possibilities of mineral wealth, the man who had spent three months there dwelt on "the dreary prospect of a range of craggy barren mountains heightened by almost constant gales of wind" and emphasized the inconvenience of a total lack of wood, the scarcity of fuel and the presence of "an incredible number of sea lyons, penguins, and other vermin". The section of the letter, however, which aroused the greatest interest in government circles was undoubtedly the statement "we have seen no appearance of any settlement or where any had ever been attempted".

The British ministry, by the summer of 1766, had very good reason to fear that it had been anticipated in its enterprise in the Falklands. Only six or seven weeks after Byron had sailed a disturbing notice had appeared in the foreign gazettes that some French frigates had recently returned to St. Malo from visiting and exploring the Malouines and the South Atlantic coasts.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Conway to the Lords of the Admiralty, 20 July, 1765. *Ibid.* Secret Instructions to Captain John McBride, 26 Sept., 1765.

¹⁴⁸ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. McBride to Egmont, 6 April, 1766.

¹⁴⁹ This letter went by the store-ship *Experiment* which sailed from Port Egmont, 6 April, 1766. It was in the hands of the Admiralty on 19 June, following.

¹⁵⁰ S. P. Spain, supplementary, 253. Egmont to Grafton, 20 July, 1765. "It was many months after Captain Byron's expedition was planned and six or seven weeks after he had sailed that the first suspicion was entertained in England of any design on the part of France to attempt this island. In Sept. 1764 a paragraph in the foreign gazettes first mentioned that some frigates were returned to St. Maloes from visiting and exploring the coast there."

The news had been despatched at once by a storeship to Byron, in a letter which had reached him on his return to Port Desire after his exploration of the islands¹⁵¹ and had received careful consideration in his return despatch to the admiralty of February 24, 1765.¹⁵² After pointing out that a reference to Frezier's voyage would prove that "the French themselves acknowledge our countryman, Sir Richard Hawkins, to have been the first discoverer of the Falkland Islands" he had written that in coasting the island "as far as any ship would dare to venture" he had seen "no smoke or signs of anybody being there", and that as for Port Egmont he was "almost certain we are the first ships that have ever been there since the creation". He reported the suspicious circumstance, however, that in sailing from Port Desire to Port Famine he had been followed by "a strange ship"

¹⁵¹ Byron, *A Voyage round the World in H. M. ship, The Dolphin*, p. 80. Byron reached Port Desire on February the fifth and there, to his great satisfaction, found the 'Florida' store-ship which had been "despatched by the Lord of the Admiralty with as much secrecy as the 'Dolphin' ". At four in the afternoon the master of the storeship came on board, bringing a packet from the Lords of the Admiralty to the commodore.

¹⁵² S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Copy of a letter from Commodore Byron to Lord Egmont, dated Port Famine, 24 Feb., 1765. "Mr. Stephens informs me the French have been lately at the Isles Malouines as Falkland Islands are called in some charts. . . ."

The French in later years claimed that the immediate reason for Byron's expedition had been a report of the establishment of a French settlement in the Falklands. "The History of a Voyage to the Malouine or (Falklands) Islands made in 1763 and 1764 under the command of M. de Bougainville in order to form a settlement there", translated from Dom Pernetys' *Historical Journal*, written in French. London, 1771. Preface. ". . . . The English, having been informed of the expedition we made there in 1764, thought it necessary to establish themselves in those islands, notwithstanding that we had already taken possession of them in the name of the crown of France. In preparing for this voyage, which excited the attention of all Europe, they took extraordinary precautions. . . . We had taken possession of these islands in the beginning of April, before the 'Dolphin' was off the stocks, and we quitted them the eighth of the same month on our return to France, where we landed the twenty-sixth of June. The English did not sail till some days after."

The exact date of sailing from England is not mentioned in *A Voyage round the World in H. M. ship The Dolphin*, but it is stated (pp. 4, 5) that on 28 June the vessel was still at Plymouth. Madeira was reached 14 July. Egmont's letter to Grafton, 20 July, 1765 (cf. note 22), and Byron's letter to Egmont, 24 Feb., 1766, do not substantiate the French accusation.

which "kept at a good distance from us but always shaped the same course", and while in the Straits hoisted the French colors and appeared "full of men and seemed to have a great many officers". He "imagined . . . that this French vessel was either from the Islands to get wood here or was upon the survey of the Straits". Before the storeship bearing Byron's letter had reached England, British suspicions of a "design on the part of the French to attempt this Island" had been further strengthened by the information that the famous French voyager, Frezier himself, had in March told "a person employed to view the ports of France" that he had been consulted by the French ministers upon this undertaking and that three or four French frigates were to be employed in the approaching summer to make the settlement.¹⁵³

This unofficial intelligence, which, as Egmont pointed out to the Duke of Grafton, might, thereafter, be supposed, "meant to have been such as deserved our notice" or of a character of which "total ignorance" could be pretended, "as it shall best suit the conduct which His Majesty may think proper to hold upon this delicate affair", hastened the secret preparations for the despatch of the expedition under McBride in the hope that the English settlement might be established at least as early as the French. By the spring of the following year, however, the admiralty was in possession of the information that a French settlement had been made, or attempted, on the east end of the Falkland Islands, in 1764, under the conduct of a M. de Bougainville, and was in a position to send out to McBride a copy of a

¹⁵³ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Egmont to Grafton, 20 July, 1765. ". . . Have only to add that as things now stand, the King's minister should immediately take this matter under consideration and come to a very speedy resolution upon it . . . that the Admiralty may receive H. M.'s orders, if anything is to be done without delay." [By next season] "the French will have certainly fixed a colony which will have taken root full twelve months before any that in that case (allowing this season to pass) can be made by us and may be then probably out of our power to expell, at least without direct and avowed hostilities which may bring on avowed hostilities with both France and Spain."

plan of the Bay of Acaron on which the rival establishment was reported to be located.¹⁵⁴

On arrival at Port Egmont in January, 1766, McBride had lost no time in following his instructions to complete as rapidly as possible the inspection of the islands which Byron had begun. Within a month of his arrival he had sailed round the group and had then commenced a minute and systematic survey of the land. As he began on the west side and as the interruption of the long southern winter hindered the work it was not until the very close of the year that any trace of French occupation was discovered. On November the twenty-fifth, 1766, a survey party discovered on the highest mountain in the West Island¹⁵⁵ a bottle containing a paper bearing evidence of the French in that part of the island in the early part of 1765. The storeship with the admiralty map of the Bay of Acaron had already arrived when this party returned to Port Egmont, and with its assistance an expedition to the east revealed the French settlement on December the third.

In accordance with his instructions McBride sent an officer with a letter demanding an explanation from the French commanding officer of the presence of the French settlement on the island, and shortly followed this up by a statement that he meant to land and inspect the settlement. Although at first the French manned their guns and seemed disposed to use force to prevent the intrusion of the English, in the end they yielded and the visit was made. McBride found that Bougainville de Nerville's commission as "commandant des Isles Malouines" was dated August 1, 1764, and that the French establishment consisted of 17 houses, 130 inhabitants, and 3 schooners. Leaving

¹⁵⁴ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. Stephens to McBride, 17 March, 1766. "My Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty having received a copy of the plan of the Bay of Acaron situated at the East end of the Malouine Islands (supposed to be Falklands' Isles) where M. de Bougainville made a settlement in the year 1764. . . . I send herewith a copy for your information and use."

¹⁵⁵ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. McBride to Stephens. "On the 25th November, the boats, having finished the survey of the west side, returned through Carlisle Sound and having landed on the east side of it, upon Mount B., the highest in the island, officers found a bottle containing enclosed papers which had been left by some French officers and others who had been on that part of the island in the beginning of 1765."

behind a solemn warning for the French to depart from his Britannic majesty's possession, McBride returned to Port Egmont, and shortly afterwards, on the arrival of Captain Raynor in the *Swift* sloop to relieve him, left for England where he arrived on the twentieth of March, 1767.¹⁵⁶

The French colony, which it was now discovered had actually been in existence on the east side of East Falkland at the time Byron carried out his flag-raising ceremony on the north shore of West Falkland,¹⁵⁷ owed its existence to a French army officer

¹⁵⁶ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253. McBride to Stephens, 21 March, 1767. "I anchored in Pembroke Sound the 2nd December, in the evening. The next morning I sent an officer upon the top of a mountain that overlooked Berkeley's Sound; who returned at noon, with an account that he had discovered the French settlement. I sailed in the evening from Pembroke Sound and next day anchored in Berkeley's Sound 4 miles short of the French settlement. . . . I sent an officer ashore with a letter to the commanding officer demanding by what authority he had erected a settlement there, who, not understanding English, sent an officer on board with a letter to me, desiring to be informed of my intentions which when I had told him he said they would not permit me to enter the port or suffer any person to come on shore. I replied that I was determined to enter the port." While the "French were busy mounting guns on a point at the entrance to the Basin", McBride worked his way further up the sound and again anchored. From this point he sent a second letter to the commander telling him of his resolution to land if officers were not allowed to examine the settlement. The boat bearing this letter was met by "a launch with soldiers in it with bayonets fixed". After waiting an hour in vain for a reply, McBride ordered his boats to be manned and armed and brought abreast of the battery, whereupon the French retired from their guns and after some further altercation "gave up the point" and McBride went on shore. After inspecting the settlement he gave the French "warning to remove from the islands", an order to which the French commander replied that they would not obey unless forced.

The first letter from McBride to the commanding officer was in the following terms: "*Jason* Berkeley Sound, 4 December, 1766". "As the Falkland Islands were discovered by subjects of the crown of England sent out by the Government for the purpose and of right belongs to His Majesty, and His Majesty having given orders for the settlement thereof, the subjects of no other Power have any title to establish themselves therein without the King's permission. I desire to be informed by what authority you have erected a settlement upon the said Islands." McBride's second letter to the commanding officer of the French settlement is dated 6 Dec., 1766. Bougainville de Nerville's letter to McBride is dated 4 Dec., 1766. McBride returned to Port Egmont, 9 Dec., and Raynor arrived, January the fourth, 1767.

¹⁵⁷ Pernety, *The History of a Voyage to the Malouine or Falkland Islands made in 1763 and 1764*, London, 1771. Preface, p. IV. "At the time even when these

Louis Antoine de Bougainville, who had made a name for himself during the Seven Years' War as aide-de-camp to Montcalm in Canada, and later in distinguished service on the Rhine. After the Peace of Paris, believing that the military profession would offer no attractions in a period of international calm, he had determined to embark on a career as an explorer. A perusal of Anson's account of his *Voyage round the World* had suggested the idea that France might find indemnification in the southern ocean for her losses in North America, and had determined him as a first step to realize Anson's plan of a station in the Falkland Islands.¹⁵⁸ Whatever the future, such a settlement seemed to promise financial rewards from a contraband trade to the neighboring Spanish and Portuguese colonies and from the development of whale and seal fisheries. A communication of this project to the French ministry met with encouragement, although the condition of the treasury made it necessary that Bougainville should find the required funds from other than government sources. With his father's assistance a frigate and a sloop were fitted out at St. Malo and prospective settlers, among whom were some Acadian families, taken on board. The destination was reached in February, 1764, and the new settlement which received the name of Port Louis began its history.

A contemporary Spanish writer,¹⁵⁹ who refused to credit Bougainville with any motives higher than a desire to attract the favorable notice of his government, thought it impossible that the French officer could have genuinely expected that either

two vessels [Byron's *Dolphin* and *The Tamer*] arrived there, M. de Bougainville was then returned; and having seen them from the port, where he lay at anchor, set sail for the Straights of Magellan where he met with them."

¹⁵⁸ Pernetty, *The History of a Voyage to the Malouine or Falkland Islands made in 1763 and 1764*, London, 1771. Introduction. "After the peace was concluded by a cession of all Canada on the part of France to England, M. de Bougainville, Knight of St. Louis, and Colonel of Infantry, conceived the idea of indemnifying France for this loss if possible, by a discovery of the southern continent; and of those large islands which lie in the way to it. A perusal of Admiral Anson's 'Voyage round the World' fixed his ideas for finding the object of his expedition, and to form a settlement there. He communicated his project to the Ministry who approved it."

¹⁵⁹ Gutiérrez de los Ríos (Count Fernan Nuñez), *Vida de Carlos III*, Madrid, 1898, Part II. ch. 2, p. 229.

Spain or England would watch his expedition with indifference. If he hoped for Spanish acquiescence he was soon disappointed, for on the first news of the establishment of the French settlement within limits which were considered by Spaniards forbidden to other nations, Charles III. caused such warm representations to be made to the French court that the latter yielded to his wishes and despatched Bougainville to Madrid to arrange for the formal cession of the settlement to Spain.¹⁶⁰ By September, 1766, this had been ratified¹⁶¹ and two months later Bougainville set sail from Nantes for a trip round the world commissioned to stop on his way at the Malouines and formally put the Spanish governor in possession of the settlement.¹⁶² The Spanish flag was raised over Port Louis, which forthwith became Port Solidad on April 1, 1767, and henceforth the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands was an Anglo-Spanish problem.

The Spanish and English settlements had continued their separate existences on opposite sides of the archipelago for two and a half years¹⁶³ when in November, 1769, Captain Hunt¹⁶⁴ of Port Egmont, while on a cruise about the islands in the *Tamar* frigate, encountered a Spanish schooner belonging to Port Solidad.¹⁶⁵ Letters which were exchanged between the heads of the

¹⁶⁰ S. P. Spain 174. De Visme to Richmond, 19 May, 1766.

¹⁶¹ S. P. Spain 175. De Visme to Shelburne, 15 September, 1766.

S. P. France 271. Lord George Lennox to Shelburne, 17 September, 1766. Cf. note 140.

¹⁶² S. P. Spain 175. De Visme to Shelburne, 6 and 27 October, 1766.

¹⁶³ S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253 Raynor to Stephens, 2 May, 1769. "Have seen nothing of the French since Captain Jordan's view of their two ships last year from the hills. I saw nothing of them when I was down the coast."

¹⁶⁴ Captain Antony Hunt arrived at Port Egmont in the *Favourite* sloop to relieve Raynor, 1 February, 1769, and Raynor sailed for England, 7 February, 1769. S. P. Spain, supplementary. 253 Raynor to Stephens, 2 May, 1769.

¹⁶⁵ *Papers relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of Falkland Islands from the English*, London, 1771, part I. Captain Antony Hunt, *Tamar* frigate, to Mr. Stephens, Plymouth Sound, 3 June, 1770. "I beg you will be pleased to acquaint my Lords commissioners of the Admiralty, that, being on a cruise off Falkland Islands the 28th of last November, I fell in with a Spanish schooner, taking a survey of them, and on examination found him belonging to a Spanish settlement on the east part, called Port Solidad, in possession of the French in 1767, and by them called Port Louis. Agreeable to my orders, I warned him to quit the islands; in consequence of which he sailed, but in a few days

two settlements after this meeting mutually laid claim to the exclusive proprietorship of the islands and each gave warning to the other to evacuate them.¹⁶⁶ The remonstrances of the governor of Port Solidad were reinforced in February, 1770, by the appearance of two Spanish frigates at Port Egmont, whose commander in a letter to Hunt expressed his surprise at seeing, on his chance entrance into the harbor for water, the British flag flying over a settlement established on a land belonging to his Catholic majesty. While charging Hunt with having violated the peace, the Spaniard said that he would not proceed to further action until he had in hand precise orders from his

after joined me again, in a harbor of the island the settlement is on, with an officer of infantry on board him, and two letters from the Governor of the settlement, which letters, and my answer, I transmit."

¹⁶⁶ *Papeles relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of Falkland Islands from the English*, London 1771, pt. I. Enclosed in Hunt to Stephens, 3 June, 1770, are two letters from Don Philip Ruiz Puenta governor of Port Solidad, to Captain Hunt, dated 30 Nov., and 12 Dec., 1769; also Hunt to Don Philip Ruiz Puenta the 10 and 16 Dec., 1769, as follows:

"Port Egmont, 10 Dec., 1769, Sir, I have received your letter by the officer acquainting me, that these Islands and coast thereof belong to the King of Spain your Master.

"In return I am to acquaint you that the said Islands belong to His Britannic Majesty, my Master, by Right of Discovery, as well as settlement, and that the subjects of no other Power whatever can have any Right to be settled in the said Islands without Leave from his Britannic Majesty, or taking the oaths of Allegiance, and submitting themselves to his Government as subjects to the Crown of Great Britain.

"I do therefore in his Majesty's Name, and by his Orders, warn you to leave the said Islands, and in order that you may be the better enabled to remove your Effects, you may remain six months from the date hereof, at the Expiration of which you are expected to depart accordingly."

"Port Egmont, 16 Dec., 1769. . . . "I must repeat, you and your Colony, together with your Effects are expected to depart from these Islands, within the Limitation specified in my first Letter."

Hunt's official protests on this occasion against the presence of the Spaniards in the Falkland Islands and the earlier protests of McBride to Bougainville de Nerville in direct reference to the presence of the French settlement of Port Louis on East Falkland Island are of special interest in connection with a controversy over the sovereignty of the Falklands which arose in the nineteenth century.

England in 1833 took forcible possession of the Falkland Islands on the basis of her former ownership of these lands and proceeded to establish a colonial government there. The Argentine Republic, which had fallen heir to the Spanish claims to the sovereignty of these islands, and whose citizens were the principal

Catholic majesty.¹⁶⁷ Realizing that these measures were probably the prelude to more serious action and well aware that the force of a frigate and a sloop was utterly inadequate to hold the station, Hunt left for England in March to lay the circumstances before the ministry. He left in command at Port Egmont Captain George Farmer who had recently arrived from England in the *Swift* sloop. A few days after Hunt's departure, Farmer had the misfortune to lose his vessel in a severe gale and this left him with one sloop to guard British sovereignty in the Falklands until reinforcements arrived.

sufferers from the reappearance of the British claims, endeavored to interest the United States government in the controversy, urging that the principle of the Monroe doctrine was at stake. In this connection it was maintained that the question of the sovereignty of the two islands, East Falkland, the home of Port Soledad (formerly Port Louis), and West Falkland of which Port Egmont was the chief settlement, should be kept wholly distinct; that, whatever the British claims might be to West Falkland (these too were disputed), England, previous to 1829, had never made any protest whatever to the exercise of Spanish sovereignty in East Falkland. Cf. Vicente E. Quesada, Argentine minister, to Thomas F. Bayard, United States Secretary of State, Washington, 4 May, 1887 (Vicente E. Quesada, *Recuerdos de mi vida diplomática*, Buenos Aires, 1904, p. 226). In this letter it is stated that "la posesión de la Maluina del este o Soledad, no fué jamás disputada por la Gran Bretaña, hasta la infundada protesta de Sir W. Parish en 1829". The documents referred to in this chapter appear to prove that this is a mistaken view. On the only four occasions on which the representatives of the rival powers met previously to the seizure of Port Egmont by the Spaniards in June, 1770, e.g. McBride's visit to the French settlement in Dec., 1766, Hunt's two encounters with the Spanish vessel from Port Soledad in Nov. and Dec., 1769, and the visit of Don Fernando de Rubalcava to Port Egmont in Feb., 1770, the English office in charge of Port Egmont protested against the presence of the Spaniards and declared the Islands to be British possessions.

¹⁶⁷ *Papers relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of Falkland Islands from the English*, London, 1771, pt. I. Don Fernando de Rubalcava to Captain Hunt, 20 February, 1770. Hunt's reply, ordering the Spaniard to evacuate the islands as possessions of His Britannic Majesty, is dated the same day. Writing to the secretary of the admiralty (Hunt to Stephens, 3 June. 1770), Hunt gives the following account of the visit of Rubalcava; "Two Spanish frigates, the *San Catalina* of 36 guns, Don Fernando Rubalcava, and the *Andaluzia* of 30 guns, Don Domingo Perletto, both from Buenos Ayres, with troops for the settlement . . . put into Port Egmont under a pretence of wanting water, which I supplied them with; and after a stay of 8 days they sailed for Port Soledad where I find that *St. Arosa*, the annual ship, was arrived. I must beg leave to observe that during the stay of the Spanish frigates at Port Egmont, they behaved extremely polite and civil, never attempting to go on shore, tho' I paid the captains and officers the compliment."

Hunt anchored in Plymouth Sound on June 3, 1770. On the following day a single Spanish frigate put in at Port Egmont claiming to be on a journey to Port Solidad and to be in need of water. When four days later four more Spanish vessels arrived the purpose became clear, and on the eighth, the two senior English officers, Captains Farmer and Maltby, ordered the Spanish intruders away.¹⁶⁸ The Spanish commander replied by pointing to the overwhelming force with which he came equipped to enforce his master's right in the Falkland Islands and advised the English to leave without obliging him to resort to force.¹⁶⁹ English officers were invited to board the Spanish vessels

¹⁶⁸ *Papers relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of Falkland Islands from the English*, London, 1771, pt. I. Captain George Farmer to Mr. Stephens, on board the *Favorite*, 22 Sept., 1770. ". . . The fourth of June, the 'Industry' a Spanish frigate, anchored in Port Egmont Harbor, having been, they said, 53 days from Buenos Ayres, put in for water, and bound to Port Soledad. The seventh anchored here four Spanish frigates which had been 26 days from Buenos Ayres, came out in company with the 'Industry' and parted with her four days before. On the arrival of those ships the 'Industry' hoisted a Spanish broad pendant. I now ordered most of the officers and men belonging to the late 'Swift' on shore to defend the settlement, and ordered Captain Maltby to get the 'Favorite' nearer into Jason's cove. One of the Spanish frigates sent an officer on board, to acquaint Captain Maltby, that if he weighed they would fire into him, which he took no notice of but got under sail. The Spanish frigate fired 2 shot which dropt to leeward of the 'Favorite'. . . Captain Maltby sent an officer on board the Spanish commodore to know the reason why one of the ships under his command had fired two shot at the 'Favorite'; his answer was that they were not fired at the 'Favorite' but as signals to him." Here follows a description of the preparation to defend the settlement. "We now wrote to the Spanish Commodore desiring as he had received the refreshments he stood in need of, that he would depart from hence. His answers with the preparations they were making left us no doubt of their real intention."

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.* After preliminary letters on the eighth of June the Spanish commodore addressed an ultimatum to Captains Farmer and Maltby on the ninth: "If you will give me authentic proof that you will quickly and with good will do this (quit this Bay) I will put with peace and quietness my troops on shore and yours will be treated with all consideration . . . and I will permit that you may carry with you all that you have got on shore. . . . But if contrary to all expectation you should be determined to maintain your new establishment I will avail myself of the forces under my command to make you quit the place with the fire of my guns and musquets, and you will be the cause of your own ruin and the fatal consequences of the warm attack that I shall make both by sea and land in order to obtain by force the accomplishment of my orders. . . ." Fifteen minutes were given for a categorical reply.

and inspect the Spanish equipment. Their report that the Spaniards had sixteen hundred men, five frigates, and a formidable train of artillery convinced the English that resistance from one sloop and a wooden blockhouse would be worse than futile,¹⁷⁰ but did not alter their determination to make the Spaniards proceed to such acts of hostility as could not be denied nor explained away. On the tenth of June, when the Spanish force had been actually landed and some shots discharged at the blockhouse and replied to, a flag of truce was hung out and the terms of capitulation were agreed to.¹⁷¹ Under these the English were permitted, after the lapse of some weeks, to proceed to England in their vessel. They arrived at Portsmouth on September 22, some ten days after the secretary of state for the southern department had been informed by the Spanish ambassador that there was good reason to believe that the governor of Buenos Ayres, acting without special instructions, had forcibly dispossessed the English of Port Egmont.

The British ministry was not unprepared for the situation. Captain Hunt's account of events of the preceding winter and spring pointed to some such sequel, while letters from Cadiz and

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.* Part II. Captain George Farmer to Stephens, 22 September, 1770.

¹⁷¹ *State Papers relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of the Falkland Islands from the English.* London, 1771, Pt. I. Farmer to Madariaga, 9 June, 1770. "Words are not always deemed hostilities nor can I think you mean in a time of profound peace to put them in execution. . . . I make not the least doubt of your being thoroughly convinced that the King of Great Britain, my Royal Master, has forces sufficient to demand satisfaction in all parts of the globe of any power whatsoever that may offer to insult the British flag. Therefore was the time limited shorter than the fifteen minutes you have allowed me it should make no alteration in my determined resolution to defend the charge committed to me to the utmost of my power."

Captain Farmer in his letter to Mr. Stephens, dated 22 Sept., 1770, gives the following description of events on the morning of the tenth of June:

"The next morning a part of the Spanish troops and artillery landed about half a mile to the northward of us: when they had advanced about half way from where they had landed, the rest of their boats, with the remainder of the troops and artillery put off from one of the Spanish frigates, and rowed right in for the cove, covered by the fire of the frigates whose shot went over the blockhouse. We fired some shot and (not feeling the least probability of being able against such a superior force to defend the settlement) hoisted a flag of truce and desired articles of capitulation which were in part granted."

Madrid had given early information of the arrival of a Spanish ship from Buenos Ayres with the news that when it left the South American port a squadron was fitting out to leave on May 6, for an attack on the British settlement in the Falklands.¹⁷² Weymouth's reply to Masserano's communication was therefore the considered view of the ministry on a situation which had long threatened, and its terms were not modified in the three months of negotiations which followed. In the first interview with the ambassador, the secretary stated that his majesty demanded a "disavowal of the proceedings of his Catholic majesty's servants at Port Egmont in which force had been used against British subjects settled there" and insisted that "the affairs of that settlement should be immediately restored to the state in which they were before such proceedings had been undertaken". The British representative was to repeat the same language at Madrid,

¹⁷² S. P. Spain 184. Braithwaite (captain of H. M. S. *Liverpool*) to Stephens, Cadiz Bay, 14 August, 1770. In Admiralty to Weymouth, 7 Sept., 1770.

Ibid., James Duff to Weymouth, 14 August, 1770, Cadiz. Received 8 Sept. "By the Spanish register ship, the *Conception*, which arrived on the tenth instant from Buenos Ayres which place she left the 2nd of May, I have received intelligence that a xebeque had been sent by the Governor of the Malouines to Port Egmont to notify to the commanding officer there that the English must evacuate said place as belonging to the King of Spain, which was refused nor were the officers or people of said vessel allowed to land there, tho' supplied with everything they wanted . . . since the return of said vessel to Buenos Ayres an armament has been fitted out there under the command of Mr. Madarriaga consisting of 4 frigates, viz. the *Industria*, *Sta. Cathalina*, *Sta. Barbara*, and *Sta. Rosalia*, and said xebecque which mounts 30 guns, on board of which vessels and a Swedish transport, which arrived from Galicia with stores, 300 men of the regiment of Majorca and the old battalion of Buenos Ayres were embarked and are to proceed 6th May to dislodge the English from the above-mentioned settlement. . . ."

Ibid., Harris to Weymouth, 23 August, 1770. Received 10 September, "The following fact which was brought from Buenos Ayres to Cadiz by the *St. Nicolas de Bary* does not correspond however with these sentiments. It sets forth that in consequence of two of His Catholic Majesty's vessels having touched at Port Egmont, in the month of January and finding it occupied by the English who not only refused to evacuate the place but even denied them admittance, a squadron of 5 frigates with 300 men were destined to sail from thence the sixth of May . . . to dislodge the English."

These reports make clear the close connection of Rubalcava's visit to the later expedition.

adding that when "the rash expedition" had been disavowed it would be in "His Majesty's power to suspend those preparations which under the present circumstances his honour will not permit him to postpone".¹⁷³

Growing steadily worse since the fall of Squillace,¹⁷⁴ relations between England and Spain had at last reached a crisis. The events which took place at Port Egmont in 1770 were not an isolated incident, but the culmination of a long series of hostile measures. In the Falkland Islands episode the spirit which had dictated the refusal of any compromise on the Manila ransom issue,¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ S. P. Spain 185. Weymouth to Harris, 12 September, 1770.

¹⁷⁴ Squillace, Charles' first minister of war and finance, *cf.* p. 338, and note 4. Throughout his official career Squillace opposed a steady opposition to French commercial activities in the Spanish peninsula, frustrating that nation's ambition to supersede the English as the first commercial power in Spain, by insisting on impossible conditions as the price of any concession asked for. At length in March, 1766, the French seized the opportunity offered by the storm of popular fury aroused by the publication of a decree attributed to Squillace, which forbade the wearing within certain areas of the national flopped hats and large capes, to have a demand for the dismissal of the undesirable minister pressed upon the king in such a form that it could not be refused. After the king from the royal balcony had unwillingly promised that the demand of the rioters should be satisfied and Squillace had been despatched in a warship to Sicily, his offices were divided between two Spaniards. The department of finance was given to Don Miguel Mosquiz, a man who had served under Squillace but who failed in the following years to uphold his former chief's ideals. Within a year of his accession to office, the French consul-general, the Abbé Begliardi, was able to depart for France with a draft treaty ensuring certain commercial privileges to the French which, in a modified form, was finally concluded in 1768, under the title of "An Interpretation of Article 24 of the Family Compact". Don John de Muniain replaced Squillace as head of the department of war.

¹⁷⁵ While the overseas interests of England and Spain centered chiefly in America, the possessions and enterprises of the two nations in other parts of their empires furnished notable controversies and incidents in the period under review. In the East Indies the disputes growing out of the conquest of Manila by Great Britain in 1762 provided matters of diplomatic discussion that occupied the official representatives of the two nations for the greater part of five years. The major item of this group of disputes was the Manila ransom controversy. Lord Rochford bore with him to Madrid a copy of the bill of exchange for two millions of dollars which had been drawn on the royal treasury of Madrid by the archbishop of Manila in his capacity of governor of the city as half the ransom price of Manila on its capture by the British on October the sixth, 1762. He was instructed to present this bill to the Spanish government for payment and endeavor to have the money placed on board such English ship of war as might chance to arrive at Cadiz for transmission to England. The ambassador reached

which had denied every application for a *cartel* providing for the exchange of deserting slaves in the West Indies,¹⁷⁶ which had disregarded every suggestion of improvements in the lot of British subjects imprisoned for offenses in America,¹⁷⁷ which had endeavored to confine within the narrowest limits the British right to navigate the waters of the Mississippi,¹⁷⁸ and which had made possible the publication of new trade regulations aimed at the destruction of England's commercial superiority in the Spanish Peninsula,¹⁷⁹ had at last found expression in an open attack on a British settlement, carried out, if not under the direct order of the Spanish court, at least under general instructions confessedly not contrary to an undertaking involving the issues of war or peace.

Considerations which in 1763 had given Rochford so firm a belief

Madrid on 6 Dec., 1763. By the twelfth he had already presented the bill and been told that "His Catholic Majesty would pay no sort of regard to the archbishop's draft on the treasury, that this official might as well have drawn upon the King of Spain to deliver up the kingdom of Grenada". In reply Rochford pointed out that it had been in consequence of the draft that the town had been spared plundering and that "there appeared a want of *bonne foy* in the terms of a capitulation not being complied with". From the positions taken in this first encounter neither party receded. Overshadowed in the first year of Rochford's term of office by a great mass of miscellaneous complaints growing out of the recent hostilities the subject was through the remainder of Rochford's stay in Spain in continuous agitation. When he left for home in May 1766, it was his "real opinion that they have never meant to pay a shilling of the debt unless compelled to it". Although Mr. De Visme, the secretary of the embassy, was instructed, after Rochford's departure, to reply to the Spanish offer to submit the issue along with others to an arbiter, to offer to accept 300,000 pounds, the Spanish government could not be induced to yield. The new ambassador, Sir James Gray, taking office in Dec., 1766, was not more successful. After being told by Grimaldi in Feb. 1768, that His Catholic Majesty "would never pay a single dollar out of his own pocket", the British government dropped the discussion as unprofitable and the account remained unpaid.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. pp. 356, 372-375.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. pp. 382-386.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. pp. 369-371.

¹⁷⁹ Six months after the trade agreement of 1768 between France and Spain (cf. note 174, p. 409), the first of a series of blows at English commerce was struck by the Spanish government in an order dated 8 July, 1768, and published at Cadiz on the twenty-eighth, prohibiting the future importation of all sorts of printed linens. As this trade was almost wholly in the hands of British merchants they regarded the order as primarily aimed at their privileges.

in Spain's desire to keep the peace had already lost some of their force before his departure in the spring of 1766, and had grown weaker with each succeeding year. As the events of the late war receded into the past the Spanish government had tended to return to the state of mind which had made it difficult for France to secure Spanish acquiescence to the conclusion of peace in 1763, namely, the belief that prolonged hostilities would have bettered results. Reform measures introduced in the years which followed the war in the military system in Old Spain,¹⁸⁰ the dispatch of numbers of able men to the colonies, and the steps taken to improve the fortifications in America, to replenish the stores and strengthen the overseas garrisons,¹⁸¹ had fostered greater confidence in Spain's powers of offense and defense. The king and Grimaldi, neither of them soldiers, depended for their views of Spanish military strength on the representations of two famous military men, Count D'Aranda¹⁸² and General O'Reilly,¹⁸³ both professionally

¹⁸⁰ Spain emerged from the Seven Years' War with her "troops in a miserable condition, her fleet worse, and her coffers empty". (S. P. Spain 168. Rochford to Halifax, 2 Nov., 1764). In land forces, Rochford reported in Oct., 1764, that there were supposed to be 102 battalions of infantry, numbering in all 72,590 men, but that these units were far from complete and that not more than 50,000 effective men could be counted. Behind these there was supposed to exist a militia of 33 battalions, numbering 27,990. The cavalry, a national force as contrasted with the infantry which had a large foreign element, numbered 11,192 men. In 1766, a great effort was made to put the infantry on a better basis and a royal decree established new regulations for it, from which the Spaniards hoped that it would soon be upon as good a footing as any infantry force in Europe, but due to the general lack of military spirit, the disproportionate number of officers, the constant practice of not paying the soldiers with a consequent necessity of winking at their custom of engaging in private business, and the fact that the king obviously took no pleasure in his troops, progress was so slow that the English ambassador saw no reason for any anxiety.

¹⁸¹ Cf. pp. 338-344.

¹⁸² Don Pedro Pablo Abarea de Bolea, Ximenez de Urrea, Comte d'Aranda e de Castel Florida; Marquis de Torres, etc., 1719-1798, commanded the Spanish army against Portugal during the Seven Years' War. The failure of the campaign was not attributed to him and in 1764 he was made governor of Valencia and after the riot in Madrid (March 23rd, 1766), he became president of the Council of Castile (April 11) and captain general of New Castile. In June, 1773, he was appointed ambassador to France and continued to hold this office until 1787. In Paris he had the reputation of being always well in advance of the Spanish government in his desire to draw the Bourbon courts into open war with England.

¹⁸³ General O'Reilly on his return from pacifying the new Spanish province of Louisiana in the spring of 1770) Cf. pp. 349, 350, 369-372, was given the

and temperamentally eager for war and inclined to exaggerate Spanish resources. With the growth of confidence in their own powers went renewed faith in the friendship of France and a decline in respect for English strength. The spirit of accommodation that had bestowed Louisiana on a defeated friend and had stood by the decision through years of difficulty,¹⁸⁴ that had transferred the sovereignty of an offending new settlement in the Falklands to an ally,¹⁸⁵ that had strongly supported the Spanish king in his revolutionary measures against the Jesuits and had loyally defended the Duke of Parma against menaces from the papal powers,¹⁸⁶ had received its reward in a heartier adoption of French political views and a warmer faith in French friendship. Constantly urged by Choiseul to prepare for a day of reckoning with Great Britain, the Spanish government in the last years of the sixties entertained no serious doubt that when it wished to try conclusions with the former enemy, it would find its ally ready to support Spanish policy. Like the rest of Europe, Spain utterly failed to comprehend the full extent of the staggering blow that the French power had received in the last phase of her long contest with Great Britain for colonial power. While she failed to revise her estimate of French strength in accordance with the Treaty of Paris, Spain's fear of offending the victor in the late contest had grown fainter as the decade advanced. The numerous changes of ministry which had followed upon the resignation of Pitt had seriously lowered English prestige in the Peninsula. A despotic government could not believe that frequent alterations in an administration dependent on a capri-

important post of governor of Madrid in which office he at once became distinguished for his zeal in advancing the cause of reform in the army.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. pp. 344-350.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. p. 403.

¹⁸⁶ The expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain, 1768, had as an indirect result the excommunication of the Duke of Parma, nephew of the king of Spain. The British ambassador, Sir James Gray, in his secret letter to the Earl of Shelburne, 28 February, 1768 (S. P. Spain 179), referred to the excommunication of the Duke of Parma "as a blow obliquely intended against this court". A month later, 24 March, 1768 (S. P. Spain 179), he wrote that Spain and France "are resolved to act in the most perfect concert in regard to the edict against the Duke of Parma" and added that every new event "affords a fresh instance of their strict union".

cious popular body for favor could pursue a consistent or harmonious public policy. The unfortunate circumstance that, with the exception of less than two years during which Sir James Gray acted as ambassador, English interests in Spain had been represented after Rochford's departure by a minister of no higher character than a chargé d'affaires had increased the tendency to forget the recent display of English strength. Finally, the failure to enforce the closely pressed claim of the Manila ransom, explained by reports from Masserano as due to the British ministry's determination to pursue peace at any cost, and the Spanish ambassador's description of the state of neglect into which the English navy had been allowed to fall, had indirectly diminished respect in Spain for the power which had extorted such humiliating terms at Paris, and had increased the readiness with which Charles III. and his government approached another break with the British nation.

But while Spain was pursuing in 1770 a general course of policy towards England that could hardly fail to result finally in a rupture there seems no evidence that she deliberately prepared in the Falkland Islands incident a conveniently timed *casus belli*. On the contrary, in the summer months which preceded the arrival in Europe of the news of the stirring events occurring at Port Egmont in June, the Spanish government appears to have been in an unusually peaceful frame of mind. Absorbed in issues growing out of the Jesuit controversy, it manifested in the very month after Bucareli's expedition a decided reluctance to respond to a suggestion from the French ally that relations with England might conveniently be brought into the forefront of immediate considerations. In the light of the subsequent course of events, it is interesting to observe that at the time that Bucareli was carrying out his energetic program in the south Atlantic, it was in France that a rupture with England was under contemplation, while in Spain the king and his ministers were still anxious to postpone the struggle to the future and were refusing to give any encouragement to French measures tending towards immediate hostilities.

As ultimately the outcome of the Falkland Islands crisis was to

depend upon the political fortunes of Choiseul, it is of importance to understand his situation in the critical months of the controversy. Never enjoying uncontested power Choiseul found his position growing steadily more precarious after the death of Madame de Pompadour in 1764. Conciliating none of his enemies and unwisely adding to their forces the influence of the new royal favorite, Madame du Barry, Choiseul found himself, by the beginning of 1770 menaced on every hand. His enemies urged upon the king that his minister of war and foreign affairs, in the internal affairs of the kingdom, extended warm sympathy to the *parlements* in the bitter constitutional struggle which these bodies were carrying on with the crown, and added to the difficulties of the state by his extreme extravagance in the department over which he presided. They also condemned every feature of his foreign policy. France, they declared, had reaped nothing but difficulties, poverty, and loss from the Austrian alliance,¹⁸⁷ from the family union with Spain,¹⁸⁸ from the recent acquisition of Corsica,¹⁸⁹ and from the policy pursued of late years in Poland.¹⁹⁰ In proportion as his embarrassments grew

¹⁸⁷ The defensive treaty between France and Austria had been signed 1 May, 1756. For the next thirty years it remained the official rule in the relations between the two powers, although its force was morally broken after 1763—the French cabinet fearing that Austria, on a favorable opportunity, would return to her old connection with England.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Morel Fatio, *Recueil des Instructions*, XII. 340. Following upon a proposal by Choiseul, made in January 1761, that there should be a defensive treaty negotiated between France and Spain and at the same time a treaty of commerce, Grimaldi, in February, proposed an offensive treaty. This encouraged Choiseul to elaborate a project of a treaty which should be at once offensive and defensive. In May, the main outlines of the Pacte de Famille were agreed to and the document was signed on 15 August, 1761. At the same time that the Pacte de Famille was signed a secret convention was concluded by the terms of which his Catholic majesty engaged to declare war against England on 1 May, 1762, if by that time peace had not been established. While signed 15 August, 1761, this convention bears the date 4 February, 1762. For a fuller discussion see Rousseau, F., *Règne de Charles III d'Espagne*, I. ch. 2.

¹⁸⁹ In the summer of 1768, France secured, with the acquiescence of Spain, the important island of Corsica from the Republic of Genoa.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. a document entitled "Précis de faits (de M. Fauier par ordre de Madame du Barry) sur l'administration de M. de Choiseul", Article C among "Pièces Justificatives" in *La Diplomatie de Louis XV et le Pacte de Famille*, par André Soulange-Bodin. Paris, 1894.

greater Choiseul's temptation increased to silence his enemies and render himself indispensable by provoking a war with England. In June, the news of a step taken by the English in India seemed to offer a possible excuse for opening hostilities. At Chandernagore, it appeared that the Compagnie des Indes had surrounded their establishment by a ditch which the English, on the ground that it violated the Treaty of 1763, had forcibly filled in. The chargé d'affaires in London asked for instructions.¹⁹¹ The matter in itself was small and the English ministry was disposed to meet the French government half-way in composing the difficulty, but Choiseul determined not to throw away an opportunity which might be long in offering itself in such an attractive form again. He accordingly sent instructions to Francis to present a firm memorial to the English court which might serve as a basis of either peace or war. By the same post he despatched a letter to D'Ossun, the French ambassador in Madrid, with orders to sound Grimaldi on the subject of a possible rupture with England.¹⁹² Into the struggle which Choiseul was now contemplating he undoubtedly had no intention of drawing Spain, having long since made up his mind as to the dangers and disadvantages of such a course,¹⁹³ but he wished to know what

¹⁹¹ Francis (French chargé d'affaires in London) à Choiseul, 15 June, 1770. L. Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 165.

¹⁹² M. Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 165. Choiseul to D'Ossun, 7 July, 1770. 'M. de Fuentes renvoye, Monsieur, un courrier de sa cour, par lequel j'écris à M. le marquis de Grimaldi; je lui mande une nouvelle affaire que nous avons avec les Anglais au sujet d'une insulte qu'un de nos comptoirs a éprouvé de la part de la compagnie anglaise dans le Bengale. Nous allons donner un mémoire sur cet objet à la cour de Londres et nous verrons ce qu'elle répondra à la demande de satisfaction que nous lui faisons que nous serons obligés de nous procurer si le ministère anglais ne nous satisfait point. Cette affaire peut devenir sérieuse . . . en attendant je vous prie de chercher à découvrir ce que pense M. Grimaldi sur cette affaire que je lui explique dans ma lettre et sur les suites qu'elle peut avoir.'

¹⁹³ Morel Fatio, *Recueil, Espagne*, XII. 353. Letter from Choiseul to D'Ossun, 16 December, 1764. The French minister pointed out to his lieutenant at Madrid, in upbraiding him for his lack of attention to French commercial interests in Spain that in any political system two points of view were to be considered; the first related to a state of peace, the second of war. If the advantages, wrote Choiseul, which one hoped to gain in the state of war were very great, then one asked little from an ally during peace, but in applying this to the Family

Spain's attitude would be. D'Ossun's reply (dated 23 July, 1770) was discouraging in the extreme. Both his Catholic majesty and his ministry, the French ambassador reported, desired the continuation of peace. They considered that Spain was not yet prepared for war and they thought that the bad state of the French finances made vigorous action, involving the initiative in a new rupture, too great a risk.¹⁹⁴ Choiseul, having in the interval decided against a break on the Indian pretext, observed in his answer, written 20 August, that he perceived clearly that Spain was mortally terrified of any incidents which could lead to war.¹⁹⁵ Events were soon to teach him that the government of Charles III. was not so fearful of war when the issue involved was immediately a Spanish interest.

Four days before Choiseul's despatch was penned, Grimaldi received a letter from M. Bucareli, governor of Buenos Ayres, which had been written on the third of the preceding April, and described in detail the measures which he was then preparing to take against the English settlement in the Falklands.¹⁹⁶ Instantly, lethargy at Madrid was flung aside and Spanish disbelief in the practicability of a new war with England vanished into thin air.

Compact it was clear from the experience of the late war that Spain would be but a dead weight in a period of hostilities on whose forces it would be absurd to count. Her feebleness had been made so apparent, that the first attention of France in a war with England would be, despite the stipulations of the Family Compact, to avoid drawing Spain into the conflict. France could legitimately expect, he thought, to profit commercially in time of peace from the riches of the Spanish peninsula, considering that in time of war she would be faced with the disagreeable necessity of making war in behalf of Spain and of preventing that nation from doing the same in behalf of France.

¹⁹⁴ L. Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 166. D'Ossun to Choiseul, 23 juillet, 1770. ". . . Au reste, Monsieur, croyez en général que Sa Majesté catholique et son ministère désirent infiniment la continuation de la paix et qu'il faut au moins deux ans encore pour que l'Espagne soit en état d'entrer en guerre."

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* Choiseul à D'Ossun, 20 Aug., 1770. ". . . Ce que j'ai vu de plus certain dans la réponse qu'a faite M. de Grimaldi à mes communications, c'est que l'Espagne meurt de peur de tous les incidents qui peuvent amener la guerre. Elle rejette en partie sur nous et nos finances cette crainte obligeante, elle a peut-être raison sur le dernier article."

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Flammermont, J., *Le Chancelier Maupeou et Les Parlements*, Paris, 1884, p. 159.

Grimaldi wrote to Fuentes¹⁹⁷ that the situation had completely changed since the departure of the last courier for France; the unjust establishment of the English on the Malouines had become a very serious matter, one which would perhaps produce war; the news had greatly agitated them. The French court, he instructed the ambassador, was to be informed that the king, after consultation with his ministers, had decided to inform the English government of the events which had transpired before this news could reach London from other sources, with a hope of preventing the British from resorting to violent measures and anticipating them in hostilities which neither France nor Spain was in a fit state to undertake. It was desirable, he said, if possible, to avoid a war for an unworthy object.¹⁹⁸ By the same mail, Grimaldi dispatched letters to Masserano which urged him to use every effort to prevent the threatened conflagration.¹⁹⁹

However, D'Ossun's later letters make it clear that as the first excitement subsided at Madrid, the prospect of war was faced with increasing equanimity.²⁰⁰ To the ambassador's amazement,

¹⁹⁷ Don Joaquin Atanasio Pignatelli de Aragon y Móngayó, etc., Comte de Fuentes, succeeded Grimaldi as Spanish ambassador in France, where he arrived in February, 1764, and continued to represent Charles III. at Paris until 1773. Previous to his post in France Fuentes had been Spanish ambassador in England, 1758-1761. *Recueil des Instructions*, vol. 12, bis, p. 443.

¹⁹⁸ L. Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 167. Grimaldi to Fuentes, 20 August, 1770. "L'établissement injuste des Anglais dans la Malouine est devenue une affaire très sérieuse. . . . Elle produira peut-être la guerre. Vous pouvez par conséquent imaginer, monsieur, combien notre situation a changé depuis que je vous expédiai mon dernier courrier extraordinaire, il y a huit jours. Cette nouveauté nous a extrêmement agités. Le roi, après avoir entendu ses ministres, a beaucoup réfléchi sur ce qu'il faudrait faire pour conserver les droits de sa couronne pour retenir les Anglais s'il est possible et pour empêcher qu'ils ne nous anticipent par une guerre que ni la France ni l'Espagne ne sont encore en état d'entreprendre avec une espérance fondée de succès. La résolution que le Roi a poussée dans ce moment critique a été celle d'informer le premier et la cour de Londres de l'expédition de Madariaga dans l'intention d'empêcher que la dite cour prenne un parti violent, comme il est à presumer si elle en était instruite par une autre voie et directement . . . afin d'éviter la guerre pour un objet qui ne le mérite pas."

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.* Grimaldi to Masserano (Spanish ambassador in London), 20 August, 1770.

²⁰⁰ J. Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, Paris, 1884, p. 169. D'Ossun a Choiseul, 3 Sept., 1770. "Vous ne vous seriez pas douté,

Charles III., who had so shortly before deprecated strongly the taking of any measures by France that could result in a rupture, now declared that, while he preferred the way of conciliation, he did not fear war. Two days before Masserano made his disclosure to Weymouth, Grimaldi, then in possession of a full account of events at Port Egmont,²⁰¹ wrote to Fuentes that in his opinion the manner in which the English had been expelled from Port Egmont left little hope that the affair could be arranged without a war, as it was neither to the interests or honor of the crown of Spain to reestablish the English in their settlement.²⁰²

Not only was Charles III. determined to yield nothing essential and had preparations for war well in hand, but by the date of Masserano's disclosure Choiseul had reached the decision not to discourage a rupture. While the question of war had fundamentally changed, and the contemplated hostilities now definitely involved all the dangers he believed inherent in a conflict in which Spain bore the leading part, nevertheless the attacks of his political opponents had attained such violence that, in the view of

monsieur, apres la repugnance manifeste de M. de Grimaldi à l'occasion de cette affaire de Chandernagor que la guerre pourrait etre amenée par les procédés vigoureux de l'Espagne; vous aurez jugé avec raison que le ministère de Madrid redoutait singulièrement tout incident qui pouvait l'occasionner. M. de Grimaldi parait encore se flatter qu'elle n'aura pas lieu; cependant, il ne néglige rien pour que l'on se mette ici le plus tôt qu'il sera possible en état de la faire offensivement et defensivement."

²⁰¹ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 13 Sept. 1770. "On the sixth of this month about noon arrived in the Bay of Cadiz the St. Catharine, one of the frigates which is supposed to have been on the expedition to Port Egmont, and the tenth this news was brought here express. As no one has been suffered to go on board or even remain along side her, it is difficult to know from which of the two places she last came; it is however most probable from the latter, and that she brings the news of the good success of the expedition. This conjecture is the more plausible as several councils have since been held, and as M. D'Aranda is come here under pretext of the indisposition of the princess, and proposes staying some days contrary to his usual custom of never sleeping out of Madrid— . . . several couriers have been despatched".

²⁰² L. Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 169. Grimaldi to Fuentes, 10 Sept., 1770. "La manière avec laquelle les Anglais ont été expulsé du port d'Egmont me laisse peu ou point d'espérance d'arranger cette affaire sans une guerre, car il n'est ni de l'honneur de la couronne, ni de ses intérêts de rétablir les Anglais dans le port d'Egmont, chose à laquelle on ne consentira jamais."

observers, he had reached the conclusion that war, under whatever conditions it had to be waged, had become a necessity for his private fortunes. Accordingly, while not openly advocating a rupture he did nothing to forward peace. Writing on the twenty-eighth of August to D'Ossun he said that he had spoken that evening to the king and that the ambassador might assure his Catholic majesty that he could count on all occasions on the king, his cousin.²⁰³ Through the first two weeks of September, the French minister contrived to send vague and on the whole encouraging messages to Madrid pronouncing decisively for neither peace nor war but urging a prompt decision one way or another.²⁰⁴ So sure was the imperial ambassador²⁰⁵ that Choiseul contemplated war in the belief that it would confirm his power, that, in company with Fuentes, he undertook to remonstrate with the French minister, in whose political fortunes both Spain and Austria were so deeply interested, on the folly of pursuing a course so contrary to the king's manifest desire. He wrote to the empress on the nineteenth of September that he and Fuentes believed that they had succeeded in instilling doubts in Choiseul of the wisdom of his policy and that they hoped he would henceforth employ himself in reconciling England and Spain.²⁰⁶ A letter written by Choiseul a week later to D'Ossun reflected the

²⁰³ *Ibid.* Choiseul à D'Ossun, 28 August, 1770. "J'en ai dit un mot le soir au roi et ce que je puis vous assurer, c'est que le roi catholique peut compter dans toutes occasions et de toute manière sur le roi son cousin." Also, Choiseul to D'Ossun, 17 September, 1770.

²⁰⁴ Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, p. 169. Choiseul à D'Ossun, 17 Sept., 1770. "Vous connaîtrez les sentiments du roi sur la circonstance présente: vous en conférerez avec M. le Marquis Grimaldi; je crois que la paix ou la guerre sont à la disposition de l'Espagne; vous ne négligerez rien pour m'instruire du parti que prendra l'Espagne, et vous lui ferez sentir que, quelque parti qu'elle prenne, celui de la paix étant préférable il faut qu'elle se détermine promptement, afin de n'avoir pas à combattre les incidents du Parlement qui s'assemblera au mois de Novembre."

²⁰⁵ Le Comte de Mercy-Argenteau.

²⁰⁶ Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, p. 170. Mercy à l'impératrice-reine, 19 Sept., 1770. "Je n'ai pas lieu de douter que le duc de Choiseul ait cru que la guerre pourrait l'affermir et rendre son ministère nécessaire: aussitôt que me suis aperçu de cette idée, j'en ai dévoilé toutes les conséquences à l'ambassadeur d'Espagne et agissant de concert, je me flatte que nous sommes parvenus à convaincre le duc de Choiseul de la fausseté de son calcul."

new spirit of hesitation. Instead of emphasizing the earlier advice of a quick decision he begged the French representative to use his utmost efforts to induce the Spanish government to postpone decided action for the moment. Even if Spain were determined on war, the English demands for the moment should, he urged, be acceded to. France, he said, must have time to get back some 8,000 sailors from the Newfoundland fisheries, and have time to provision her fleet; later the question of the sovereignty of the islands could be permitted to provide an excuse for a rupture, when France, forewarned, could be relied on to be ready and at the king of Spain's service in a satisfactory manner.²⁰⁷ At the time that this letter was being despatched, Grimaldi had placed before him the English government's answer to Masserano's disclosure.

The official British representative at Madrid at this critical period was James Harris,²⁰⁸ better known under his later title of Lord Malmesbury. Appointed secretary of the embassy at Madrid through the influence of Lord Shelburne in the autumn of 1767, he had been left as chargé d'affaires when ill health had compelled Sir James Gray²⁰⁹ to leave Spain in August, 1769.

²⁰⁷ Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, pp. 171, 172. Choiseul à D'Ossun, 26 Sept., 1770. "Dans tous les cas surtout après la première démarche du prince de Masserano, il n'y a pas de doute qu'il faut accorder les deux propositions anglaises, quand même l'on voudrait en Espagne faire la guerre. Je vous observerai au reste que nous avons huit mille matelots à la pêche de Terre-Neuve qui ne reviendront qu'à la fin d'Octobre . . . et, qu'il faut au moins trois mois pour préparer des vivres pour notre flotte, pour les troupes que nous avons à envoyer en Amérique et en Asie, ainsi que pour l'Approvisionnement des habitants des colonies. . . . Ainsi donc, même avec le projet de la guerre, il faut acquiescer, à ce que je pense, aux propositions anglaises, sauf après, si l'on veut la guerre en Espagne, de la faire arriver dans la discussion du droit de souveraineté sur les îles Malouines; alors, étant prévenus des projets de l'Espagne, nous serons prêts de tous côtés et je puis assurer le roi d'Espagne que nous serons prêts et à ses ordres d'une manière satisfaisante." At the same time Choiseul wrote to Grimaldi directly.

²⁰⁸ Besides his despatches included among the State Papers relating to Spain, the *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris, first Earl of Malmesbury*, ed. by the third Earl of Malmesbury, London, 1844, are of some interest for this phase of his life.

²⁰⁹ Sir James Gray succeeded the Earl of Rochford as British ambassador at Madrid. His instructions were dated 26 June, 1767, but he did not arrive in the Spanish capital until the following October.

Thus when the Falkland Islands incident became a matter of diplomatic controversy between England and Spain in the middle of September, 1770, Harris, although then but a youth of twenty-four, had carried the full burden of responsibility for more than a year. On September 3, he had written to the home office that as there seemed every prospect that some time would elapse before he should have a principal, it would be to the advantage of the interests he was charged with if he were given a higher diplomatic character.²¹⁰ The outbreak of the Falkland dispute prevented his request from being acceded to, but his able handling of the delicate matters which this crisis threw into his care was to establish his diplomatic reputation and win for him in his twenty-fifth year a diplomatic post of the first rank.²¹¹

The courier, bearing Weymouth's letter demanding disavowal and restitution, reached San Ildefonso on September 24. The evening of the following day, Harris had a long interview with Grimaldi. The Spanish minister's reply to the terms of the memorial²¹² which Harris presented was couched in very vague words. The English, he said, had had reason to foresee the occurrence of such an event as that which had just taken place at Port Egmont since Spanish disapprobation of the English establishment on the Falklands was notorious and had frequently been a subject of discussion.²¹³ He was, however,

²¹⁰ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Robert Wood, 3 Sept., 1770.

²¹¹ James Harris, *Diaries and Correspondence*, London, 1844. In 1771 he was appointed minister plenipotentiary to Prussia. He was later the British representative in Russia, and, still later, at the Hague. His death occurred in 1820. M. de Talleyrand once observed to Harris' grandson, "Je crois que Lord Malmesbury était le plus habile ministre que vous aviez de son temps."

²¹² S. P. Spain 185. Dated San Ildefonso, 25 Sept., 1770. Enclosed by Harris to Weymouth.

²¹³ The subject had been a matter of diplomatic discussion in 1766 and 1767 in connection with the settlement of the Manila ransom issue. After Rochford's departure from Spain in May, 1766, he became the British ambassador at the French court and from this post continued to attempt to devise a means of inducing Spain to pay the Manila ransom money. For a time it was believed that Spain's anxiety to prevent an English settlement on the Falklands could be made to serve this purpose. Choiseul was repeatedly assured that the one means of inducing the British government to desist from the Falkland undertaking was for Spain to pay the ransom in full. The French minister on his part pressed the British to accept the Spanish offer to submit all matters in dispute between the

exceedingly sorry that the affair had taken place. The moment that they had learned that it was intended they had despatched a vessel from Coruña with orders to prevent it. Unfortunately, the boat had arrived too late. Nevertheless he could not blame the conduct of Bucareli, founded as it was on the established law of America. But, Spain being desirous of peace and having much to lose by war, as far as His Catholic Majesty's own honor and the welfare of his people were compatible with the British demand, the latter would be agreed to. Three days later Harris was taken aside and assured that his memorial had been laid before the king who was resolved to do everything in his power to terminate the affair in an amicable manner. He admitted the English demand and assented to its every point, consistent with his honor, which, as well as England's, was to be considered. Orders, Harris, was informed, had been sent to Prince Masserano to lay before the British government several ideas which had been suggested and which as they differed from the British in terms and not in essentials, he trusted would be adopted.²¹⁴

Commenting on this reply in a letter to Choiseul dated September 27, D'Ossun remarked that Spain had made a response to England which would permit the continuation of negotiations.²¹⁵ Many considerations combined in the closing days of September to render delay in the march of events agreeable to the Spanish minister. Besides the great advantage of a longer period in which to prepare for possible hostilities, a prolongation of negotiation promised the necessary time for the many obscure political factors of the situation to declare themselves.

two courts to an arbiter and urged that if Louis XV. were chosen England should have the ransom on the condition that she would desist from her colonizing activities in the Falklands. When it became evident that the English government would not consent to the mediation of the King of France and would give no permanent assurance in reference to the Falklands, the discussion gradually subsided and France extricated herself from the Falkland Islands controversy by formally handing these islands over to Spain in April, 1767. Cf. S. P. France 272, Rochford to Shelburne, 13 Jan. 1767, 12 and 18 Feb., 1767; Shelburne to Rochford, 23 Jan., 1767.

²¹⁴ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 28 Sept., 1770.

²¹⁵ J. Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, Paris, 1883, p. 162. D'Ossun to Choiseul, 27 September, 1770.

Choiseul's views and the dependence to be placed on the French ally were far from clear. While Grimaldi could reassure himself by the reflection that since the last peace with England the burden of the French colleagues' correspondence had been the urgent need for the two allied crowns to prepare for a renewal of hostilities, he could recall that as recently as July, Choiseul had been ready for an immediate declaration and had written D'Ossun that France was in a better state to sustain war than Spain, being absolutely prepared in every physical way with the exception of ready money which, however, he had added, was never lacking in France when real necessity for expenditure arose.²¹⁶ The tenor however of the letters and messages received since the beginning of the Falkland crisis had been of a curious, non-committal, and disquieting character. While not discouraging a rupture, Choiseul had left the decision of war or peace to Spain and had failed to commit himself to definite promises concerning French support in the event of hostilities. Moreover, features in the political situation in Spain made a period of negotiation desirable to Grimaldi. The king's conscience, he knew, would not be satisfied unless his majesty could point to some efforts made by his government in the direction of peace, although the success of the war party in making Charles believe that his own and the nation's honor was involved in the issues of the Falkland incident ensured that the advances could not be of too conciliatory a character. The consideration that war meant the further aggrandizement of Aranda and O'Reilly, whose influence had been growing in an alarming manner since the fall of Squillace, provided another argument against too great haste in rushing into hostilities.

That Grimaldi, however, looked upon the concessions which Masserano at the close of September was authorized to make as merely a temporary expedient calculated to prevent surprises until he should have the situation better in hand, may be judged from the immense impression which the receipt of Choiseul's letter of September 26 made upon him. In a letter

²¹⁶ J. Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, Paris, 1883, p. 158. Choiseul to D'Ossun, 20 August, 1770.

to Weymouth dated October 4, Harris gave an account of an interview he had had with the Spanish minister immediately after the arrival of the express from Fontainebleau.²¹⁷ The letter from France, Grimaldi had told the English representative, had informed him of the apprehensions of the French court on the naval armament which England was making. "He spoke to me upon it," wrote the chargé d'affaires, "with a degree of alarm and impetuosity I never found in him. He said it was an ill return to the early intelligence they had given of the expedition to the Falkland Islands, that he would consider it as a lesson for the future and not again by his frankness draw himself into a situation to incur the censure of his master and the reproach of his allies. He could not but suppose we were meditating some treacherous stroke by the warmth with which we had given these orders and the celerity with which they were executed. In a word, my lord, it would be very [amazing]²¹⁸ to you to read the strange inconsistent sallies passion induced him to make." Having first read Choiseul's clear indication that immediate French aid might not be forthcoming and his plain advice to agree at least for the moment, to the English demands, there was doubtless a ring of sincerity in Grimaldi's exclamation "I hope in God and I call Heaven to witness that I desire nothing so much as peace and dread nothing so much as war". From this conversation and the general bearing of the ministers Harris "perceived the great consternation, and that, so far from having a design to break with us, they fear nothing so much as our breaking with them and would do anything to palliate the present affair".

Once comprehending that Choiseul considered a further postponement of the day of reckoning with England desirable, Grimaldi bent his efforts to secure this end, but, as he wrote to his French colleague two months later, he found himself surrounded by almost insurmountable embarrassments. All other members of the ministry were unanimous in the view that without sacrificing his honor the king could not agree to the English demands. His attempts to win the king to concessions were described by

²¹⁷ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, separate, 4 October, 1770.

²¹⁸ Word omitted in the MS.

his enemies as a disregard of the king's and the nation's honor and a submission to anything that pleased France, were it white or black. He was not, he told Choiseul, master to guide matters to the point that he would wish, and he doubted if anyone in the world could succeed in leading the king in matters in which he believed his honor interested or his dignity compromised.²¹⁹ Through the early days of October, the war party was especially active in forcing Grimaldi along the path towards open hostilities. Military and naval preparation, which had been secretly in progress since the first news of Bucareli's action,²²⁰ became so open that they could not be denied when Harris broached the subject to Grimaldi.²²¹ On the eighteenth of the month the chargé d'affaires reported that three great bodies of troops were forming in Murcia, Andalusia, and Galicia for the purpose of covering the three important ports of Cartagena, Cadiz, and Ferrol.²²² General O'Reilly, in charge of these operations, was in "the highest favor."²²³ As the month advanced, however, and no encouragement came from France, Harris believed that Grimaldi's pacific views gained ground "while D'Aranda's violent advice lost credit". On the eighteenth, he "had good reason to believe that His Catholic Majesty is inclined personally

²¹⁹ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, p. 179. D'Ossun to Choiseul, 20 December, 1770. "L'objet principal de M. le Comte d'Aranda et de ses adhérents est de discréditer le Marquis de Grimaldi dans l'esprit de la nation espagnole et de le faire regarder comme vendu à la France et comme peu jaloux de l'honneur de la gloire et des intérêts de la monarchie." Cf. also Grimaldi to Choiseul, 24 December, 1770. (Blart, pp. 182, 183.)

²²⁰ J. Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, Paris, 1883, p. 160. D'Ossun à Choiseul, 27 août, 1770.

²²¹ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, separate, 11 Oct., 1770. "Having good reason to believe that the ministry here were about to send orders to the several ports to arm such ships as they could, I yesterday waited on M. Grimaldi and easily perceived from his conversation that my conjectures were not ill-founded. He told me His Catholic Majesty was brought to this extremity by our armaments still being continued and that although he would avoid war and was ready to sacrifice anything but his honour to preserve peace, yet his Kingdom was not so reduced as to suffer himself to be menaced."

²²² S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 18 October, 1770. (Private and separate.)

²²³ *Ibid.* "Generally O'Reilly who is in the highest favour seems to direct all these military operations."

to come to an accomodation with us at almost any rate and that these, from the little encouragement given him by France on the occasion, are the sentiments of Grimaldi."²²⁴ He added, "M. D'Aranda, a warm enterprising man, is of the contrary opinion and went so far as to call M. Grimaldi before the King, an indolent, lazy minister. This has bred ill blood between them, and M. D'Aranda, though he assists at the councils, takes very little share. General O'Reilly I look upon as of the same opinion as M. D'Aranda, for although they are by no means well together, yet they would both find their advantage in a war. The rest of the ministers are only consulted *pro forma* and very little weight is paid to what they say."

On October 25 a courier arrived at Madrid with despatches for Harris dated the seventeenth of the month which set forth the British answer to the Spanish proposals. "Prince Masserano," wrote Weymouth, "has proposed a convention in which he is to disavow any particular orders given to M. Bucareli upon this occasion, at the same time that he is to acknowledge that he acted agreeably to his general instructions and to his oath as Governor. He is further to stipulate the restitution of the Falkland Islands and he expects that His Majesty is to disavow the menace of Captain Hunt, which, he says, gave occasion to the steps taken by the Spanish Government." The secretary expressed "His Majesty's great surprise and concern at a proposition so inadequate to the satisfaction demanded", and ordered the chargé d'affaires to tell the Spanish minister that "when the King's moderation condescended to demand of the Court of Madrid to disavow the proceedings of the Governor of Buenos Ayres and to restore things precisely to that situation in which they stood before the rash and unwarrantable undertaking of the Governor as the smallest reparation for the injury received that he could possibly accept, His Majesty thought there was nothing left for discussion except the mode of carrying that disavowal and that restitution into execution". The Spanish government was to be informed that "His Majesty adheres invariably to his first demand and that, without entering into the insurmountable

²²⁴ *Ibid.*

objection to the matter of this proposed convention the manner alone is totally inadmissible, for His Majesty cannot accept under a convention that satisfaction to which he has so just a title without entering into any engagements in order to procure it, that the idea of his becoming a contracting party upon this occasion is entirely foreign to the case, for having received an injury and demanded the most moderate reparation of that injury, his honor will permit him to accept, that reparation loses its value if it is to be conditional and to be obtained by any stipulation whatsoever on the part of His Majesty."²²⁵ In an accompanying secret despatch Harris was given permission to leave the original letter with Grimaldi.

When the contents of this despatch were laid before him, the Spanish minister expressed concern that the British court had not been satisfied with the concession offered. "I wish to God I knew what you expect," he exclaimed, "I thought we had done so much there remained nothing for us to do. We have allowed ourselves in the wrong, have offered the most ample reparation. Surely it is very hard that at that point where we are insulted you will not listen to our solicitations although they are such as you might acquiesce in without the least diminution of satisfaction we give you."²²⁶ A week later Grimaldi informed Harris that fresh instructions were being sent Prince Masserano and read the despatch for England to him. Harris wrote to Weymouth that the minister seemed willing to agree to everything we demand except our not disavowing the menace of Captain Hunt.²²⁷

From France, Choiseul, on hearing the purport of the British reply, urged both Grimaldi and D'Ossun to put forth renewed efforts to maintain the peace. In his despatch to D'Ossun he asked the ambassador as a personal service to himself to use his credit with Charles III. to secure the required concessions.²²⁸

²²⁵ S. P. Spain 185. Weymouth to Harris, 17 October, 1770.

²²⁶ *Ibid.* Harris to Weymouth, 7 November, 1770.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*

²²⁸ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 173. Choiseul à D'Ossun, 21 Octobre, 1770. "Vous ferez ce que vous pouvez, monsieur, pour faire adopter cet avis, et vous rendrez un grand service et à la cause générale et à moi en particulier."

The French minister, the comte de Mercy explained to Prince Kaunitz (the Austrian chancellor), was beginning to realize that without money, credit, or generals, it was not wise to undertake war and was attempting to calm the war spirit in Spain.²²⁹ That he still occasionally revolved in his mind the possibility of war as a way out of political embarrassments at home was evidenced by such a reflection as that which occurred in a letter to D'Ossun of October 24, in which, after urging the ambassador to try to induce Spain to keep the peace, he remarked that French financial affairs were going from bad to worse, but their military and naval preparations were very satisfactory; given time, he said, all would be well, the essential thing was not to hurry. In the council meetings the French minister steadily upheld the view that if Charles III. eventually decided for war France must not denounce the Family Compact, but render support and that therefore adequate preparations for possible hostilities were necessary. As the autumn advanced, his position became more precarious. At the close of November he told Fuentes that he feared that his enemies would succeed in persuading the king, not indeed to break the Family Compact completely, but to abandon the king of Spain on this occasion to his own resources.²³⁰ On November 29 and again on December 2, the king deliberately closed the council meeting when his ministers brought forward the question of French military preparations. A week later the king gave still clearer indication of his disapproval of the course which the long Spanish dispute was taking when, on Fuentes venturing to call his attention to the great necessity for military preparations in France, his majesty merely looked at the Spanish ambassador fixedly and then turned his back without replying.²³¹

²²⁹ D'Arneth et Flammermont, *Correspondance secrète du Comte de Mercy-Argenteau aux l'Empereur Joseph II et le Prince de Kaunitz*, II. Paris, 1891. Mercy à Kaunitz, 20 October, 1770. "M. de Choiseul commence cependant à se persuader que sans argent, sans crédit, et sans généraux, il n'est pas conseillable de faire la guerre. Il tâche maintenant de l'éviter et de calmer, en Espagne, des redomontades, desquelles il avait lui-même donné l'exemple."

²³⁰ Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, p. 168. Mercy à Kaunitz, 2 December, 1770. Résumé of this letter.

²³¹ *Ibid.* Paris, 1883. pp. 169-171. Mercy to Kaunitz, 18 Dec., 1770. Résumé of this letter.

Made in this way to realize the imminent danger of repudiation before the eyes of all Europe of the instrument which he regarded as the chief work of his administration and the very ground work of French foreign policy, and knowing that Spanish negotiations in London were at an end, Choiseul took the step of sending a new project of accommodation to Francis and Masserano with instructions to lay it before the British ministry.²³² By its terms the English demands were compiled with, but in the disavowal the name of Bucareli was omitted and the discussion of the proprietary right to the islands was formally reserved. In excusing himself to Grimaldi in a letter of December 10 for having thus intervened in a matter which primarily concerned Spain he asked his Spanish colleague to reflect that while the Falkland Islands belonged to Spain, the accessory of the affair, war, would belong to France as well as Spain.²³³ In making this final effort to adjust the dispute Choiseul had very little hope of its success, but he would have, as he wrote to D'Ossun, the satisfaction of knowing that he had done what he could.

All Europe, including the two courts most concerned, believed that hostilities were on the point of breaking out.²³⁴ Matters had indeed reached a crisis. On November 26, Weymouth had written to Harris that as Masserano "continued to hold language which gives very little reason to expect just satisfaction" he was, as privately as possible, to apprise the lieutenant governor of Gibraltar of the uncertain state of affairs, letting him know that General Cornwallis and other

²³² Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 177.

²³³ *Ibid.* p. 178. Choiseul à Grimaldi, 10 December, 1770. "Vous serez peut-être fâché contre moi, mon cher camarade, que j'aie envoyé à Londres un projet sur un objet qui regarde directement l'Espagne, aussi simple et un peu contraire, dans la forme, à vos instructions. Songez, mon cher camarade, que les îles Falkland appartiennent à l'Espagne, mais que tout l'accessoire de l'affaire, mais que la guerre appartiendra à la France comme à l'Espagne."

²³⁴ Add. MSS. 35500 Hardwicke Papers 152. "Extracts from Lord Stormont's and Mr. L. Anglois' Correspondences with H. M. Secretaries of State for the Northern Department". Vol. I, 1763-1771. Stormont (British ambassador at Vienna), to Rochford, 8 Dec., 1770. "Prince Kaunitz, and afterwards the Emperor himself, expressed to me [Lord Stormont] their uneasiness lest the disputes between England and Spain should kindle a general flame." Austria as the ally of France took a special interest in the course of the dispute.

officers belonging to that garrison had been ordered to their posts, and was also to inform the consuls of "the danger of a rupture".²³⁵ Weymouth represented the most moderate opinion in the British parliament on the situation. Since the king's speech to both houses of parliament on the thirteenth of November which declared his majesty's intention of not discontinuing warlike preparations until "I shall have received proper reparation for the injury, as well as satisfactory proof, that other powers are equally sincere with myself in the resolution to preserve the general tranquillity of Europe",²³⁶ the opposition, headed by Chatham and Richmond, had given the government no peace on the Spanish question. In the debate on the address and, a week later, in the debate on the motion, introduced by the Duke of Richmond on November 22, which called for the production of all papers bearing on the seizure of the Falkland Islands, the outrage was declared to be the natural consequence of the English government's passive attitude on the annexation of Corsica by France and the wretched state into which the forces of the Empire had been allowed to fall. The management of the crisis itself was violently attacked as cowardly and pusillanimous to the last degree. Why, speech after speech asked, had nothing been done in the summer months between Hunt's arrival on June 3 and the appearance of the *Favourite* on September 12, when a decisive stroke at that time might have brought into English ports the Newfoundland ships and the sailors of the enemy, and have at one stroke ruined their marine? Why were preparations progressing so slowly at the moment and why was the government in such a cowardly manner attributing the violence to the act of a Spanish governor and not boldly treating it as aimed at the British empire

²³⁵ S. P. Spain 185. Weymouth to Harris (no. 16), 28 Nov., 1770. This letter reached Madrid on December 10, and a messenger was at once despatched to Cadiz with a letter for the English consul, Hardy, "apprizing him of the present precarious state of affairs". Under cover of this letter, others for the lieutenant governor of Gibraltar were enclosed which Hardy was desired to forward "by sea should immediate opportunity offer or direct my servant how to get there without exposing himself to discovery, in passing the lines at St. Rocco". Cf. *Ibid.* Harris to Weymouth, 10 Dec., 1770.

²³⁶ Annual Register, 1770. p. 252.

by His Catholic Majesty?²³⁷ While Weymouth's objection to the Duke's motion on the ground that it was ill timed and that the negotiations then in progress were of a "nature too tender to undergo the general inspection of every power in Europe" was sustained, his appeal to his hearers to recollect that "conquests were seldom made except at an expense exceeding their intrinsic value" and his confession that for his part war brought "such horror to his imagination" that he wished to "procrastinate the period of calamity as long as honour would justify delay"²³⁸ obviously met with little sympathy. This debate drove home the conviction which he expressed to Masserano when he told the ambassador toward the close of November that no English minister could without danger to himself modify the two original demands. In harmony with this view Choiseul's compromise was rejected and the French chargé d'affaires in London wrote home on the fourteenth of December that if war was to be prevented it was necessary to subscribe to the British ultimatum without delay, otherwise peace would hardly last beyond the first days of January.²³⁹

Meanwhile the reports from Spain spoke of the increasing appearance of war.²⁴⁰ The French and English ambassadors both wrote to their respective courts that everywhere military preparations were being pushed forward with the greatest speed

²³⁷ Parliamentary History, vol. 16. Speeches of Colonel Barré, p. 1039, of Edmund Burke, p. 1044, of the Duke of Richmond, p. 1084, of the Earl of Chatham, p. 1091.

²³⁸ *Ibid.* Vol. 16, p. 1082.

²³⁹ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 179. Francis to Choiseul, 14 December, 1770. Résumé of this letter.

²⁴⁰ S. P. Spain 185. On November 7, 1770, Harris reported to Weymouth that orders had been given for the fitting out of 32 sail of the line which were to be divided into 3 squadrons and that the disposition of the Spanish naval forces in Europe were as follows: At Cartagena 3 sail of the line and 2 frigates; at Cadiz 5 sail of the line and 4 frigates; at Ferrol 24 sail of the line and 8 frigates. Few of the vessels at this latter port, the chargé d'affaires wrote, were equipped for sea.

Ibid. 186. On January 13, 1771, Harris wrote to the secretary of state that there were at that time two fleets ready to sail. One was at Cadiz and consisted of 8 or 10 ships and was reported to be for Havana, the other which was at Ferrol (whose number he did not mention) was said to be destined for the business of protecting the coast of Old Spain.

and that the militia was being incorporated in the regular forces. The ports, especially Cadiz, were having their fortifications strengthened, transports bearing troops for America were being constantly despatched while all warships were under orders to be fitted out with the greatest expedition and the impressing of seamen was in progress.²⁴¹ Consul Hardy reported from Cadiz that many circumstances induced him to believe that his Catholic majesty had a scheme in cogitation against Gibraltar, and that it was certain that a French engineer of note had laid a plan for the capture of the place before the king who was believed in Cadiz so anxious to carry that favorite point that he would "be willing to sacrifice half his kingdom to succeed in it".²⁴² A letter from Grimaldi, dated December 6, demanding advice from France on certain military details and precise information as to what help would be forthcoming from Spain's ally made the prospect even clearer to Choiseul. Did the French minister think that a declaration of war was necessary? Was it his opinion that Spain should commence hostilities? Would the French at once do the same and what precisely were the projects of the French government? Would French privateers be placed on the seas? Would the French war vessels be sent out? What was the exact number of these and where were they? Did France wish to undertake an expedition against Jamaica immediately?²⁴³

That the responsibility for the prevalence of the war spirit at Madrid was emphatically not Grimaldi's but rested on the war party which had succeeded in persuading the king to their way of thinking that his honor was involved, was the clear opinion of both the French and British representatives. Harris expressed himself in the following terms in a letter written to the secretary of State on December 17: "Grimaldi, I am convinced, will

²⁴¹ For other English accounts of the military preparations in prospect, see the following despatches: S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 26, 29 Nov., 6, 13, 17, 27 Dec., 1770, and Hardy (Consul at Cadiz) to Weymouth, 3, 26 Dec., 1770, and J. Banks (Consul at Coruña) to Weymouth, 31 Dec., 1770.

²⁴² S. P. Spain 185. Hardy to Weymouth, 26 December, 1770.

²⁴³ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, p. 178. Grimaldi à Fuentes, 6 December, 1770.

strain every nerve to accommodate affairs not either from conviction or from a pacific disposition but because France wishes it and because he receives repeated instances from M. de Choiseul to effect it. Nevertheless I fear the restless and ambitious temper of M. D'Aranda²⁴⁴ who has on the one hand represented to the king that the honour of the Spanish nation would be exposed by acceding to our propositions and on the other has painted the state of both its army and finances in the most flattering (and I may venture to add) false colours and at the same time has artfully insinuated that we are by no means in a similar condition. I fear these arguments will have more weight than they ought and will greatly obstruct if not totally prevent an amiable conclusion."²⁴⁵ The French ambassador writing three days later to his government emphasized the fact that Grimaldi's position was very delicate, the advice of his colleagues and of D'Aranda, whose chief object was to discredit Grimaldi, being for war; these men, the French representative said, had inspired the nation to desire war with an ardor which approached enthusiasm. His Catholic majesty was greatly affected by the hauteur of the British ministry and although the king said that he desired the maintenance of peace, D'Ossun believed that he really inclined to war.²⁴⁶

The effect of the situation on the Family Compact drew very similar comments from D'Ossun and Harris. The Englishman wrote on November 26, "The little share the Court of France takes in this present dispute and the imperious manner in which it has treated this nation has rendered its alliance more odious than ever to the Spaniards. They use no bounds in decrying the French and the friendship of the French,"²⁴⁷ and again six weeks later he wrote, "People here are more disgusted

²⁴⁴ Cf. Note 182, p. 411.

²⁴⁵ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 17 Dec., 1770.

²⁴⁶ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, p. 179. D'Ossun à Choiseul, 20 Dec., 1770. "Le roi catholique est vivement affecté de la hauteur du ministère britannique. Il a des anciens griefs contre les Anglais et de plus de la propension aux sentiments des anciens chevaliers, et quoique ce monarque dise qu'il désire le maintien de la paix j'oserais croire qu'il incline intérieurement pour la guerre."

²⁴⁷ S. P. Spain 185. Harris to Weymouth, 26 November, 1770.

than ever with the French alliance and in their conversation put no bounds to their manner of decrying it".²⁴⁸ On December 10, D'Ossun warned Choiseul that if his Catholic majesty sacrificed personal sentiment in consideration of these facts—that France was not in a state to go to war, "notre consideration ici subira une furieuse atteinte."²⁴⁹

By December 22, Charles III. had decided to endeavor to bring matters to an issue with his delinquent ally by writing a personal letter to Louis XV. In this epistle he reminded the French king that the Spanish order of 1764 bearing on the establishments which the English were seeking to make in South America had been only despatched after it had received the approval of his Christian majesty and his ministers.²⁵⁰ It was this order which had provoked the present difficulty. As in this instance, so it had since been his practice, knowing the desire of the French king to maintain peace, not only to overlook an infinity of injustices from the hands of the English and to take the greatest care to prevent pretexts for quarrels from occurring, but even to take no resolutions which might conceivably lead to

²⁴⁸ S. P. Spain 186. Harris to Weymouth, 13 January, 1771.

²⁴⁹ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, p. 178. D'Ossun à Choiseul, 10 December, 1770. Two weeks later, 24 Dec., 1770, D'Ossun wrote to Choiseul (Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, pp. 191, 192), "C'est une chose surprenante que cette nation à qui nous reprochions avec raison d'avoir une haine invétérée pour la France et une inclination marquée pour les Anglais ait adopté, dans un instant des sentiments tout à fait contraires; Les villes, les provinces, le haut clergé, les moines, le public, offrent à l'envie leurs biens, leur revenue, leurs personnes pour faire la guerre à l'Angleterre." Cf. the contrary view of popular opinion: S. P. Spain 185, Hardy (consul at Cadiz) to Weymouth, 31 Dec., 1770. "I landed at Cadiz amidst a crowd of people rejoicing on a supposition that my coming was a certain signal of peace."

²⁵⁰ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, p. 181. Charles III. to Louis XV. 22 Dec., 1770. ". . . J'ai non seulement dissimulé une infinité d'événements injustes, contraires aux traités et au droit des gens de la part des Anglais, mais j'ai eu le plus grand soin d'éloigner tout prétexte à cette nation de nous chercher querelle, ne prenant même aucune résolution qui put induire de loin un prétexte aux Anglais de nous faire la guerre sans la consulter auparavant avec Votre Majesté, en avoir son approbation. Tel a été l'ordre que je donnais en 1764 à l'égard des établissements que les Anglais cherchaient à faire dans l'Amérique Méridionale. Il fut trouvé convenable, nécessaire pour Votre Majesté, son ministère, et sur le consentement que j'en reçus il fut expédié. C'est pourtant cet ordre même qui causa la querelle présente et qui sert de prétexte . . . "

disputes without first consulting the French king. In the present difficulty there were no expedients which he had not adopted to satisfy English pride, going just as far in that direction as the honor and dignity of his crown would permit. He thought, however, that this temper had contributed to render the English ministry more difficult. Nothing had satisfied that country which wished a humiliation which would discredit French and Spanish power in the world. Nevertheless, the French ministry had intimated that it was necessary to go beyond these considerations and think only of the moment without considering the future. He was, however, convinced that the French king was as jealous in these matters as himself. While he was willing to accede to any expedient which did not directly wound his honor or dignity, he believed that if a way still remained of securing peace, it was to be found in adopting a contrary system to that which the French ministry had hitherto pursued, in other words to accelerate the French preparations for war. He closed with an appeal to the French king to have the Spanish ambassador informed of the nature of these so that the French and Spanish measures and armaments might be combined.²⁵¹

This action on the part of Charles III. came too late to affect the course of events. Before the despatch had left Madrid, both the English and the French courts had taken decisive action. In England Lord Weymouth²⁵² resigned the seals of the southern department on December 18,²⁵³ and was succeeded in office

²⁵¹ L. Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1915, pp. 181, 182. Charles III. to Louis XV., 22 December, 1770. This letter while written on 22 December was not despatched until 24 December. Cf. note to p. 181.

²⁵² Thomas Thynne, third Viscount Weymouth, 1734-1796. On Jan. 20, 1768, Weymouth was appointed secretary of state for the northern department, but in October of the same year, on Shelburne's resignation, was transferred to the southern department, where he remained until December 18, 1770. He continued out of office for the next five years. On 10 November, 1775, he again became secretary of state for the southern department. In March, 1779, on the resignation of Suffolk, Weymouth took charge of the northern department in addition to his own seals. In the autumn of the same year, 1779, he resigned both offices. In 1789 he was made first Marquis of Bath. He died in 1796. (Cf. *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

²⁵³ *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, pp. 1371, 1372. Governor Pownall: "On the fifteenth of December, H. M. Secretary of State (Weymouth) did not think

by Lord Rochford, a minister whose experience as ambassador in Spain had left him a convinced believer in the effectiveness of extreme measures in managing disputes with the Spanish court. On the twenty-first of December he despatched the following instructions to Harris. "All negotiations having been for some time at an end between Lord Weymouth or myself and the Spanish ambassador, to whom His Catholic Majesty thought fit to commit his answer to the King's demands, which answer was found totally inadmissible, and it being inconsistent with His Majesty's honour to make any further proposal to the Court of Spain, I am to signify to you the King's pleasure that your longer stay at Madrid appearing entirely unnecessary, you prepare to return home with all convenient speed."²⁵⁴ On the same day in France, Louis XV. decided upon the dismissal of Choiseul. In a council meeting his majesty proposed, really as a test of Choiseul's willingness to carry his wishes into execu-

that he could safely remain in office conducting that negotiation unless it was brought to some point precise and determinate. He therefore on that day made four propositions to the cabinet. These propositions were rejected and on the eighteenth he found it necessary to resign office."

Flammermont (*Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, note, p. 183), offers the following explanation: "Le 18 décembre lord Weymouth avait déclaré dans le conseil des ministres que la dignité de l'Angleterre exigeant qu'on commençât sur-le-champ les hostilités; mais il fut seul de son avis et il donna sa démission." In view of the energetic policy pursued by his successor immediately upon taking office, this explanation seems improbable.

Sir Horace Walpole, *Letters* ed., Peter Cunningham, London, 1857), in a letter to Sir Horace Mann, dated 18 December, 1770, makes the following observation: "The day before yesterday, Lord Weymouth resigned the seals. If you ask why, so does everybody! and I do not hear that anybody has received an answer." There is here some confusion in date. Pownall, who had made a special investigation into Weymouth's actions and movements spoke in the House of Commons of the resignation as taking place on the eighteenth.

²⁵⁴ S. P. Spain 185. Rochford to Halifax, 21 Dec., 1770. "Convenient speed" in the eighteenth century by no means implied immediate departure. On the contrary, Rochford specifically warned Harris against allowing his preparations to become known until six or seven days after the departure of a messenger bearing tidings of the approaching rupture to the consul at Cadiz whose duty it should be not only to warn the British merchants and masters of ships at Cadiz, but to forward letters to the governor of Gibraltar and the commander-in chief of the British forces in the Mediterranean. Consuls at other ports in Spain were also to be notified without sparing expense.

tion that the minister should draw up a letter to the king of Spain clearly stating that the king of France wished for peace and that no considerations would make him take part in the war if it were declared.²⁵⁵ On Choiseul's remonstrance that he was then awaiting a reply from Spain to a very direct letter of December the nineteenth, and that he had many times given his word that France would never fail to support the stipulations of the Family Compact, Louis XV. took his decision. This, he expressed in an autograph letter to Charles III. which he sent to D'Ossun on December 23,²⁵⁶ with instructions to deliver it secretly into the hands of his Catholic majesty. In his despatch he expressly stated that the domestic conditions of France were such that war would be a terrible evil for him and his people and that if his Catholic majesty could make some sacrifices in order to preserve peace he would render a great service to mankind in general and to the French king in particular. He also significantly assured the Spanish king that no change of ministers would alter the relations between the two courts.²⁵⁷ Before this letter left Paris, Choiseul had his final interview with the king in the course of which, according to a report which reached Sir Horace Walpole, the king made use of the expression, "Monsieur, je vous ai dit que je ne voulais point la guerre". By the evening Choiseul realized that his disgrace had been irrevocably decided

²⁵⁵ M. le Baron de Besenval, *Mémoires*, IV. pp. 20-22. Paris, 1805-7.

²⁵⁶ Dated 21 December, 1770.

²⁵⁷ J. Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, p. 190. Louis XV. to Charles III., 21 Dec., 1770. "Monsieur, mon frère et cousin, Votre Majesté n'ignore pas combien l'esprit d'indépendance et de fanatisme s'est repandu dans mon royaume. La patience et la douceur m'ont conduit jusqu' à présent, mais, poussé à bout et mes parlements s'oubliant jusqu' à vouloir me disputer l'autorité souveraine que je ne tiens que de Dieu, je suis résolu de me faire obéir par toutes les voies possibles, La guerre, dans cet état serait un mal affreux pour moy et pour mes peuples, mais ma tendresse extrême pour Votre Majesté, l'union intime qui règne entre nous, cimentée par notre pacte de famille me fera toujours tout oublier pour elle. Mes ministres ne sont que mes organes; ainsi quand je me crois obligé d'en charger, rien ne peut apporter de changement dans nos affaires, et tant que je vivray, nous serons unis. Si Votre Majesté peut faire quelques sacrifices pour conserver la paix sans blesser son honneur, elle rendra un grand service au genre humaine et à moy en particulier dans les présentes où je me trouve."

upon and on the following morning the blow fell in the form of a peremptory order from the king bidding him relinquish the seals of office.²⁵⁸

The arrival of Louis's letter at Madrid, December 30, caused an entire reversal of Spanish policy.²⁵⁹ Forced to choose between war with England accompanied with an almost complete break with France and surrender to the English demands, Charles chose the latter. Grimaldi sent the new instructions to Masserano on January 2, explaining their character to the ambassador by the words, "Le roi est persuadé particulièrement par les instances du roi son cousin qui lui a demandé quelque sacrifice possible, attendu la situation actuelle de la France".²⁶⁰

The British government was made aware of the arrival of the changed orders on January 18.²⁶¹ As the ministry was only too anxious to ward off a war which threatened their tenor of power with disaster, the Spanish overtures met with no fresh difficulties and on the twenty-second of the month an agreement in the form of a Declaration from Prince Masserano and an acceptance by Lord Rochford was signed. The Declaration stated that his Catholic majesty "Has seen with displeasure

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 185. On the 24 December at 10 o'clock in the morning the Duke de la Vrillière bore the following order to the Duke de Choiseul: "J'ordonne à mon cousin, le duc de Choiseul, de remettre en démission de sa charge de secrétaire d'Etat et de surintendant des Portes entre les mains du duc de la Vrillière et de se retirer à Chanteloup jusqu' à nouvelle ordre de ma part."

²⁵⁹ Blart, *Les Rapports de France et de l'Espagne*, p. 193. Cf. also Flammermont, *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*, p. 191. D'Ossun au roi de France, 31 Dec., 1770. D'Ossun in handing Louis' letter to Charles informed him of the dismissal of Choiseul. Charles received the news with the exclamation, "Tant pis pour le roi, mon cousin". This was softened by D'Ossun in his report to Louis into "qu'il etait fâché pour le bien du service de Votre Majesté, que M. de Choiseul eut mérité cette disgrâce."

²⁶⁰ Blart, *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne*, p. 194. Grimaldi to Masserano, 2 January, 1771. On the same day Charles III. wrote to his nephew, informing him of the decision taken. This letter arrived in Paris on 19 January. Louis' relief was immense and found expression in a letter to the king of Spain, dated 24 January, full of effusive expressions of affection for his relative: "nos liens sont indissolubles et aucun changement dans nos ministères ne peut les faire changer, ainsi que j'en ai déjà assuré Votre Majesté."

²⁶¹ Walpole, *Memoirs of George III.* pub., Sir Denis de Marchant, London, 1845, IV. p. 258.

this expedition . . . disavows the said enterprize . . . and engages to give immediate orders that things shall be restored in the Malouines, at the Port called Egmont, precisely to the state in which they were before the tenth of June, 1770, for which purpose His Catholic Majesty will give orders to one of his officers to deliver up to the officer authorized by His Catholic Majesty the port and fort called Egmont with all the artillery, stores, and effects of His Britannic Majesty and his subjects which were at that place, the day above named; agreeable to the inventory which has been made of them". Two points are of interest—the name of Bucareli was not mentioned and a reservation was included to the effect that the engagement "cannot nor ought anywise to affect the question of the prior right of sovereignty of the Malouine Islands otherwise called Falkland Islands".²⁶²

These points as well as all other conceivable weaknesses which could be urged against the Declaration from an English point of view were brought freely to light in the course of the debates which followed the announcement of the transaction to parliament on January 25. The opposition denounced the whole agreement as an ignominious compromise in which there was no satisfaction and no reparation. The document, they said, was wholly injurious to the British claims of sovereignty to the whole group of Falkland Islands, the restitution being specifically confined to Port Egmont when it was known that Spain had "made her forcible attack on pretence of title to the whole".²⁶³ Prince Masserano's reservation should not have been allowed without at least the inclusion of a counterclaim by Great Britain. They also found fault with the document in that it made no provision for "such censure or punishment of the Governor of Buenos Ayres as might make it manifest that he did not act under any orders general or particular" and lacked "such explanation of his general orders as might sufficiently secure

²⁶² S. P. Foreign Spain, 186. The original document, in French, with seal attached. A copy of "The Acceptance of the Declaration" by Rochford is also present.

²⁶³ *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, p. 1383. Protest against the Address approving the Spanish Declaration respecting the seizure of the Falkland Islands—House of Lords, article 10.

His Majesty's possessions against the like insult and injury in time to come".²⁶⁴ The government's opponents lamented the want of any provision in the agreement for compensation to Great Britain for the heavy expenditure of funds made necessary by Spain's unwarrantable attack on a British possession left unexplained for more than seven months and finally they strongly suspected that "France had had too much to do in the transaction", that in some fashion that power had been allowed an interference, tending to give a sanction and an efficacy of the most dangerous character to the Family Compact, no other explanation being reasonable to account for the sudden change on the part of the Spanish court.²⁶⁵ Despite these vigorously pressed objections to the terms of settlement an address to the king approving of the Spanish Declaration was finally carried in both houses.²⁶⁶

Meanwhile in Spain diplomatic intercourse between the Spanish government and the British embassy was in suspension. Rochford's letter of December 21 instructing the chargé d'affaires to withdraw from his post with all convenient speed, had reached Madrid on January 4.²⁶⁷ On the twelfth, Harris informed Grimaldi of his instructions and shortly afterwards took leave of the king.²⁶⁸ Preparations for departure, however, filled the

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1360. Mr. Dowdeswell's Resolutions. House of Commons.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1369-1377. Governor Pownall.

²⁶⁶ *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, p. 1377. Vote in the House of Commons for the Address 271, against 157. *Ibid.*, pp. 1380-1385. Terms of a Protest signed by 18 opponents of the Address in the House of Lords.

²⁶⁷ Grimaldi's instructions to Masserano ordering him to agree to the British terms had been despatched two days before the arrival of this letter at Madrid.

²⁶⁸ S. P. Spain 186. Harris to Rochford, 13 and 17 January, 1771. When informed of Harris' orders to leave Grimaldi "appeared much affected" and "expressed great concern at the disagreeable turn affairs were likely to take". He inquired if there was any time set for the English representative's departure and when told "with all convenient speed" he said that he "was sorry, for his majesty would immediately recall his ambassador". He gave no indication whatever of the changed orders sent ten days previously to Prince Masserano (13 January).

In his despatch of 17 January, Harris reported that his messenger, bearing the important letter with news of the approaching break to the consul at Cadiz had been stopped at Cordova, his letters taken from him and sent to Grimaldi, who returned them, apparently unopened, to Harris who again despatched them to Cadiz.

remainder of the month,²⁶⁹ and Rochford's letter of January 18, ordering immediate resumption of correspondence with the Spanish ministry, found the representative, on February 8, only twenty leagues out of the city. From this place, the small village of Algora, a night's journey carried Harris back to the Spanish capital. To his surprise and embarrassment his official welcome was ungracious in the extreme. In his first interview with Grimaldi, the Spanish minister informed him that he refused to present him to the king or do business with him as British *chargé d'affaires* until he produced credentials. Harris vainly protested that he had acted in that capacity for a year and a half without having any papers, the minister merely replied that he considered himself justified in insisting on the rigid rule of etiquette by the abrupt manner in which England had recalled her representative, and that in the future Spain meant to "measure step for step". He referred disparagingly to the two long periods during which British diplomatic affairs had recently been carried on at Madrid by officials of no higher standing than *chargé d'affaires* and pointed out that when the French ambassador was absent that country appointed a minister plenipotentiary for the interval.²⁷⁰

Through the following month, while awaiting instructions, the English representative remained merely an observer of events. His letters of the period are of considerable interest. The reconciliation, he wrote, gave "the greatest joy to every rank of the people", but he was persuaded that "had this court been seconded by that of Versailles it would never have been brought about and the ministry of His Catholic Majesty subscribed merely not to bring the Family Compact into disgrace which would have been rendering it ridiculous to all Europe had France, as she certainly would, swerved from her engagements the first time she was called upon to fulfil them". The king, he represented as able to accommodate himself to circumstances and to make it appear that

²⁶⁹ S. P. Spain 186. Monroe (consul general) to Rochford, 25 January, 1771. "Mr. Harris proposes to depart hence within four days."

²⁷⁰ S. P. Spain 186. Harris to Rochford, 9 February, 1771. Mr. De Visme acted as *chargé d'affaires* from the departure of the Earl of Rochford in May, 1766, to the arrival in Spain of Sir James Gray in October, 1767, and Mr. Harris had been in charge of the embassy since Sir James Gray's departure in August, 1769.

he had been genuinely glad of an opportunity to prove his love of peace. He showed pleasure at the news of the warm reception that had been accorded Masserano at the British court after the signing of the Declaration, and at the announcement of a new British ambassador. Grimaldi did not exhibit the same composure and cordiality. He was suffering "from a sense of the loss of personal credit in France" and was "filled with ill humour and peevishness" by the "odious reflections D'Aranda cast upon him for the inconsistent manner in which he had conducted this affair", (e.g., that of the Falkland Islands). He had "lost so much credit with every rank of people" reported Harris, "that nothing but the firm hold he has in the King's good opinion maintains him in his post."²⁷¹ The Declaration itself, Harris wrote, was kept as secret as possible, being only shown to those to whom the government was obliged to allow a view of it, while a report was spread abroad that the English government had given "a verbal assurance to evacuate the Falkland Islands within a space of two months'".²⁷²

²⁷¹ & P. Spain 186. Harris to Rochford, most private, 14 Feb., 1771. *Ibid.*, 21 and 25 Feb., 1771.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 14 Feb., 1771. The alleged existence of a secret agreement made by Great Britain at the time of the formal restitution of Port Egmont by the Spaniards to withdraw from these islands constituted a part of the argument in which in the nineteenth century, the Argentine Government protested against the reoccupation of these islands by the British. (Cf. Quesada, *Recuerdos de mi vida diplomática*, Buenos Aires, 1904, pp. 210 and 238-243. Vicente E. Quesada to Thomas F. Bayard, 9 Dec., 1885, and 4 May, 1887.) The whole tone of Harris' letter makes it evident that when he wrote the words quoted in the text he did not take the report seriously but considered it to be merely a part of the general attempt of the Spanish government to save its dignity as far as possible in the trying situation in which it found itself. In the correspondence which followed the establishment of British colonial government in the Falklands in 1833, Lord Palmerston absolutely denied that any such agreement as that alleged by the Argentine government had ever existed. (Cf. Quesada, *idem.*, pp. 214-221. Letter from Thomas F. Bayard to Vicente E. Quesada.)

It appears to the present writer that even granting the existence of a promise to withdraw the British settlement from Port Egmont after its formal restitution (and a promise of amore extensive character is not claimed) the British claims to the sovereignty of the islands after 1774 remained the same as before the events of June 1770. The Spanish Declaration of 1771 provided for a return to the state of affairs existing previous to the forced evacuation of Port Egmont by the British on 10 June, 1770. At that time England claimed the Falkland Islands

On March 6, a despatch from Rochford arrived at Madrid which announced the British government's acquiescence in the Spanish demand for credentials and appointed Harris, with warm words of appreciation for the skill with which he had played his part in a difficult matter, as minister plenipotentiary until the arrival of Lord Grantham, the new ambassador. With reference to the Spanish demand the British minister remarked that he thought "Grimaldi's punctilio misplaced at a time of reconciliation".²⁷³ On March 9, Harris was once again presented to his Catholic majesty as the officially recognized British representative.²⁷⁴

The most important matter which fell to his care in the following weeks was the business of securing the acquiescence of the Spanish government in a scheme for a simultaneous reduction of armaments to a peace basis on the part of England, Spain, and France. Rochford had broached the subject to the French and Spanish ambassadors early in March acquainting them of his Britannic majesty's "intentions to make such a reduction of his

group on the basis of the discovery of them by Davis and Hawkins in the sixteenth century; that this claim extended to the East Falkland Island and was not limited merely to the western island is evident from the instructions to McBride (*cf.* pp. 397-401) and his protests in consequence of these instructions directed to Bougainville de Nerville the commanding officer of the French colony of Port Louis on the East Falkland Island. The Spaniards, on the other hand, in 1770, claimed the whole Falkland group on the ground that the French, from whom they derive their claims, had been the first to establish an effective occupation of the islands, maintaining that the mere discovery by the British, unaccompanied by occupation, had not been sufficient to establish any claim to the islands.

These opposing claims remained the same after the restoration of the British at Port Egmont as before except that the forced restoration had naturally strengthened the *de facto* position of the British. On the withdrawal of the British force in 1774 the greatest care was taken to leave there the "proper marks or signs of possession of its belonging to the Crown of Great Britain", (*cf.* note 283, p. 446) *e.g.*, a leaden tablet affixed to the door of the blockhouse, the transaction being described by the secretary of state to the British representative in Spain as "a private regulation with regard to our own convenience". In reoccupying the islands in 1833, Great Britain was once again enforcing as in 1771 her view on the sovereignty of the islands.

²⁷³ S. P. Spain 186. Rochford to Harris, 22 Feb., 1771. *Ibid.* Harris to Rochford, most private, 11 March, 1771.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 11 March, 1771. "When I delivered my credentials His Catholic Majesty received them in the most affable manner and after hearing the few words I had to say, replied, 'Je vous ai toujours vu avec plaisir: mais jamais avec tant que dans cette occasion.'"

marine forces as should show his sincere desire for maintaining peace" but pointing out that he naturally expected that their courts would go "at least *pari passu*" with him and be willing to give authentic engagements that they would disarm at the same time. He proposed that the period for disarmament should be that from April the first to the tenth.²⁷⁵ When Harris at the close of March approached Grimaldi on the matter, the latter evinced great discontent at the evidence which he said Great Britain gave of maintaining a considerably augmented peace establishment. He referred especially to the despatch of fleets to the East and West Indies and to the Mediterranean. The British fleet in the latter place, he said, had never been so formidable and looked as if "you meant to control us". "I can assure you," he added, "that if you have so large a fleet, we will have as large a one and if you sail about from place to place, we will also." However, after Grimaldi had seen the king he gave the promise that Spain would follow exactly what England did and would proportion her peace establishment to theirs.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁵ S. P. Spain 186. Rochford to Harris, 8 March, 1771.

²⁷⁶ The date of disarmament in England and Spain seems not to have been simultaneous in spite of efforts that it should be so.

S. P. Spain, 186. Rochford to Halifax, 23 April, 1771. Rochford wrote that Prince Masserano, having said directions were actually given in Spain for disarmament between the twentieth and the thirtieth and the French ambassador having made the same declarations, "His Majesty has been pleased this day to give orders for the reduction of the navy to the Peace establishment".

S. P. Spain 187. Captain Collins to Lord Sandwich, 24 April, 1771. Collins, however, wrote from the Bay of Cadiz that no orders had been at that time received for disarming the ships of war in the harbor, that everything at Cadiz and the vicinity remained in the same situation as before the convention had been signed.

Ibid. It was not until May 16 that Harris wrote to Rochford, "Grimaldi told me orders had been sent to the several forts for disarming such ships as a probability of rupture had occasioned to be equipped."

Two letters from Charles III. to Louis XV. mark a change in the Spanish king's attitude between March and May on the question of disarmament.

Danvila, *Reinado de Carlos III*, Vol. IV, pp. 152, 154. In a letter of 16 March, 1771, Charles III. drew the attention of the French king to the fleets which England was preparing for the Indies, Jamaica, and the Mediterranean, and urged that it necessitated an equal circumspection on the part of the Bourbon powers. He had decided, he informed the French king, to keep two squadrons armed. On May 27, he wrote to say that he had disarmed but had given such orders that his forces could be rapidly assembled again.

The last of the Falkland Islands affair was the ceremony of the formal restitution of Port Egmont which took place at that port on September 16, 1771. Captain Stott, in command of two sloops and accompanied by a storeship, arrived at the Falklands on the 13th of September and found the Spanish colors flying and troops on shore, and the Spanish commanding officer in possession of such orders that his task was accomplished without difficulty. He described the formalities which took place in a letter to the secretary of the admiralty in the following words. "On Monday the sixteenth of September, I landed followed by a party of marines and was received by the Spanish officer who formally restored me the possession, on which I caused His Majesty's colours to be hoisted and the marines to fire three volleys and the "Juno" five guns and was congratulated as were the officers with me by the Spanish officer with great civility on the occasion. The next day Don Francisco with all the troops and subjects of the King of Spain departed in a schooner which they had with them. I have only to add that this transaction was effected with the greatest appearance of good faith without the least claim or reserve being made by the Spanish officer on behalf of this court."²⁷⁷ At the close of the month, Captain Stott leaving behind him the sloop *Hound* sailed for home. On his arrival, instructions were sent to the British ambassador at Madrid to express to the Spanish minister his majesty's satisfaction at the manner in which the affair had been conducted.²⁷⁸ Grimaldi's remark on receiving an account of the restitution was reported to have been that "that disagreeable business was well over".²⁷⁹

Two and a half years after reestablishing with such pains a garrison upon the Falklands, in April, 1774, the British government withdrew its force leaving only a flag flying and a leaden inscription affixed to the blockhouse to mark for the next half century the British claim to the sovereignty of these south Atlantic islands. From the moment of restitution the admiralty had confessed itself at a loss for a plan by which possession of the

²⁷⁷ S. P. Spain 188. Captain Stott to Mr. Stephens, 9 Dec., 1771. (Enclosed in Admiralty to Rochford, 11 Dec., 1771.)

²⁷⁸ Add. MSS. 24 157. Rochford to Grantham, 13 Dec., 1771.

²⁷⁹ S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 9 Jan., 1772.

islands could be "constantly and effectively kept up".²⁸⁰ For the moment it had been decided to maintain twenty-five marines, fifty men, and a small vessel there,²⁸¹ although it was recognized that this garrison, which it was estimated would cost the State £ 3,552 annually to maintain, would be unable to protect the Islands in case of a rupture.²⁸² By 1774, when it was no longer a question of showing the world that "nothing can deter Great Britain from asserting her rights", when popular excitement had subsided and the miserable experience of the English garrison had conclusively proved that the reported fertility of the islands had been much overstated, the government felt able to withdraw the seamen and marines on the ground that the advantages of keeping a garrison there were not worth the expense.²⁸³ In send-

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.* Lord Sandwich to Rochford, 26 Feb., 1772.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.* Rochford to Grantham, 6 March, 1772. The last body of men sent to the Falkland Islands previous to the withdrawal in 1774 consisted of 6 officers, 18 seamen, and 23 marines, who had with them an armed shallop. They arrived at Egmont on 28 Feb., 1773, and left 20 May, 1774. Cf. Penrose, B. *Last Expedition to Port Egmont in the Falklands in the year 1772*, London, 1775, pp. 5 and 6.

²⁸² S. P. Spain 189. Admiralty to Rochford, 26 Feb., 1772. "We are at a loss to suggest any plan by which the possession of the port and fort of Port Egmont and the islands of Falkland may be constantly and effectually kept up even at any expense; but we are of opinion that a smaller number of men than those now employed will equally maintain a mark of possession and that the present number would be no security to the place in case of a rupture with a foreign power." An estimate is enclosed of the charge of maintaining 50 men at Falkland Islands with a small vessel to attend them—3,552 pounds.

Ibid. Rochford to Lord Sandwich, 29 Feb., 1772. The letter expresses approval of the plan suggested in the letter from the admiralty and gives orders for it to be carried into execution.

²⁸³ B. Penrose, *An Account of the Last Expedition to Port Egmont in the Falklands in the year 1772*, London, 1775, pp. 76, 77. "May twentieth everything being ready for our departure we took a formal leave of the islands the seamen being ranged in order, and the marines drawn up under arms, while the following inscription, engraved on a piece of lead, was affixed to the door of the blockhouse: 'Be it known to all nations that the Falkland Islands, with this fort, the storehouses, wharfs, harbors, bays and creeks thereunto belonging are the sole right and property of His Most Sacred Majesty George the Third, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc. In witness thereof this plate is set up, and His Britannic Majesty's colors left flying as a mark of possession by S. W. Clayton, commanding officer at Falkland Islands, A. D. 1774.'

"The Union Jack being then hoisted, the people gave three cheers, and we immediately embarked with the utmost order and satisfaction, waiting only for a fair wind to proceed on our voyage. We took our departure without the least regret."

ing information of this step to Grantham Rochford remarked that there was no necessity of officially communicating it to the Spanish ministers "since it is only a private regulation with regard to our own convenience", but as he was inclined to think from what passed formerly on this subject, "that they would be rather pleased by this event", if they mentioned it, Grantham might "freely avow it without entering into any reasoning".²⁸⁴ With this communication the Falkland Islands passed out of the diplomatic correspondence of the two courts in the period covered by this monograph.

²⁸⁴ Add. MSS 24160. Rochford to Grantham, 11 Feb., 1774.

"Lord North in a speech some days ago in the House of Commons, on the subject of the naval establishment this year, mentioned the intention of reducing our sea forces in the East Indies . . . and at the same time hinted, as a matter of small consequences, that in order to avoid the expense of keeping seamen or marines at Falkland's Islands, they would be brought away afterwards, leaving there the proper marks or signs of possession and of its belonging to the Crown of Great Britain."

CHAPTER IV

ANGLO-SPANISH RELATIONS, 1771-1776

The Falkland crisis left behind a sense of injured pride and public humiliation on the part of Spain and on the side of England a total want of confidence in the pacific protestations of Spain. The earlier hope of the British government that mature consideration of the losses of the Seven Years' War would lead Charles III. to desire a reversal of alliances had disappeared within three years of the peace of Paris and each succeeding year had only served to make it clearer that the Spanish government not only meant to cling to the political system which the Bourbons had carried with them to Spain but had become its chief supporter. This impression the events of the recent crisis had confirmed, and its termination brought no revival of belief in the possibility of weaning Charles III. and his ministry from their partiality for France. Some advantage, however, it was hoped could be gained from the strained relations of the Bourbon partners. The "Secret and Private Instructions" of the new ambassador²⁸⁵ set forth that "as by the late transaction in which the king of Spain found himself deserted by France when he reclaimed her assistance in virtue of the well known *Pacte de Famille* it is highly

²⁸⁵ Thomas Robinson, second Baron Grantham (1738-1786). Grantham entered the House of Commons for Christchurch in Hampshire in March, 1761. Five years later (11 Oct., 1766) he became one of the commissioners of trade and Plantations. In Feb., 1770, he was promoted to the post of vice-chamberlain of the household, was sworn a member of the privy council and in September of the same year succeeded his father as second Baron Grantham. His appointment as ambassador to Madrid occurred on the 25 January, 1771. His instructions were dated May 23, 1771. He arrived at the Spanish court on August the tenth, 1771, and remained in Spain as British ambassador until the outbreak of war in 1779. From December, 1780 to June, 1782, Grantham held the post of first commissioner of the Board of Trade and Plantations. In July, 1782, he became secretary of state for the southern department in Shelburne's administration, an office which he resigned in April, 1783. He died at Grantham House, Putney Heath, 20 July, 1786.

probable that that connection may be much weakened and that there may remain some resentment in the breasts of His Catholic Majesty and ministers", the English representative should "use all possible means to confirm such disposition by inculcating on proper occasions to the Spanish ministers our sincere desire to cultivate the strictest friendship with the court of Spain . . . which we consider as our old and natural ally and lament to have seen for some time past engaged in so intimate a manner with our natural rival as to give us room to doubt of her good disposition towards us".²⁸⁶ But while placing a certain confidence in the momentary divergence of French and Spanish policy, and perhaps more on "the ancient inclination for our friendship of the Spanish people—though the Spanish court has been and may continue to be governed by French counsels",²⁸⁷ the general tenor of Grantham's instructions and the correspondence carried on with him in the first years of his ministry showed how little faith was placed in the continuance of peace beyond the time when the Spanish government should find itself prepared for a renewal of hostilities.

In these years the American phase of the relations of England and Spain are very closely interwoven with European events, the chief incidents being either counterparts of European controversies or their results dependent on the turn of affairs in European chancelleries.

The first matter to engage Lord Grantham's attention on the assumption of his new duties in August, 1771, was the old issue between the two courts concerning the privileges of British warships in the European and colonial harbors of Spain. In its European aspect the controversy had been a lively issue between the two courts since 1767.²⁸⁸ British warships were accused by

²⁸⁶ Add. MSS. 24157, Secret and Private Instructions to Lord Grantham, article 4.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.* Article 2.

²⁸⁸ This very long dispute was inaugurated by the Spanish ambassador in London, Prince Masserano, in November, 1767, in an office to Shelburne in which he stated that his government, on the ground that French and Dutch war vessels were in the habit of loading with silver at Cadiz and selling it fraudulently outside of Spain, was asking all courts to give more precise orders to the captains of their

the Spanish government "of being in a manner stationed in their ports for illicit purposes",²⁸⁹ of carrying out great quantities of silver, of aiding in the contraband activities of merchant vessels, and of giving encouragement to deserters from other vessels in the harbors and from the Irish regiments of the Spanish army.²⁹⁰ In June, 1770, the very month in which the British were forced to evacuate Port Egmont, the British secretary of state, fearing that the good relations of the two countries were actually threatened by the issue, had drawn up a long answer to the many Spanish memorials in which considerable concessions were made to meet the Spanish complaints.²⁹¹ Dissatisfaction, however, continued, and on July 16, 1771, some months before Grantham's arrival in Spain, royal orders had been sent to the Spanish ports directing that foreign ships of war were to be permitted to enter and stay in Spanish ports only so far as they were by treaty entitled to do so.²⁹² The prompt acquiescence of the British government in the

warships not to stay in Spanish harbors longer than was necessary. While British vessels had not been actually discovered in this trade, there was always one, the ambassador said, at Cadiz, a second arriving before the first left. (S. P. Spain 178. Masserano to Shelburne, 4 Nov., 1767.) As the admiralty refused to take any action on this vague complaint Masserano renewed his remonstrances a year later stating that in the interval his government's suspicions of contraband activities of the English warships had been fully realized. (S. P. Spain 180. Masserano to Weymouth, 29 Nov., 1768.) From this date forward Spanish complaints on this score were very frequent.

²⁸⁹ S. P. Spain 181. Gray to Weymouth, 20 March, 1769.

²⁹⁰ S. P. Spain 182. Masserano to Weymouth, 26 July, 15 and 19 Nov., 1769.

²⁹¹ S. P. Spain 184. Weymouth to Masserano, 12 June, 1770. *Ibid.* Weymouth to the Admiralty, 12 June, 1770. Two English officers against whom specific charges had been brought by the Spaniards were not to be allowed to return to a part of the world where they would again offend his Catholic majesty and five midshipmen who had been arrested while going through the gates of Cadiz laden with silver were dismissed from the service. Meanwhile the admiralty was instructed to recommend to the admiral commanding his majesty's forces in the Mediterranean to cultivate a good understanding upon every occasion with officers of his Catholic majesty and to promote friendly intercourse, discountenancing in all who served the king "smuggling acts which are a disgrace to the Service and dishonour the character of officers and gentlemen".

²⁹² S. P. Spain 187. Harris to Rochford, 16 May, 1771. A hint of this possible action had been thrown out by Grimaldi as early as the previous May, when in a conversation with Harris, he had exclaimed against the ill use which the British ships of war made of the liberties accorded them and had declared that "the only way he saw of effectively stopping it was by not allowing ships to enter port without assigning a specious reason such as the treaties required".

general principle of this order²⁹³ gave great satisfaction at Madrid, and accounted largely for the Spanish government's complacency when it later developed that the British concession was not as great as had at first appeared. In the course of the following month it became clear that England meant to insist that if Spain, according to the terms of the treaty of 1667, secured a recognition of her order that ships of war must be furnished with an excuse if they were to remain in her ports, England should retain its treaty right to unquestioned entrance to the harbors and a tacit recognition by the Spanish government that the British warships were themselves to be the judges of the extent of their necessities and therefore of the validity of their excuses.²⁹⁴

While this controversy was in progress in Europe, Anglo-Spanish intercourse in America in 1771 offered in an incident connected with the schooner, *Sir Edward Hawke*, an illustration of the contemporary New World phase of the question of the privileges of British warships and their intimate relation to contraband trade. In the very month in which the order was issued in Old Spain narrowing the rights of foreign warships in Spanish continental ports the *Sir Edward Hawke* of the British Jamaica squadron sailed on a cruise under the command of Lieutenant Gibbs. On July 24, when twenty leagues off Cartagena, the warship sighted a Spanish *guarda costa* and being in need of wood and water the English commander sent on board the foreign vessel for information as to the nearest source of supply. The answer was returned that if the

²⁹³ Add. MSS. 24157. Rochford to the Lords of the Admiralty, 30 Aug., 1771. Rochford despatched a copy of the order accompanied by the sixteenth article of the treaty of 1667 to the admiralty with instructions that it was his majesty's pleasure that the commanders of his ships should conform to the terms of the order. The order from the lords of the admiralty to Sir Peter Denis, commanding British ships in the Mediterranean, was dated 5 Sept., 1771.

²⁹⁴ These points were especially discussed in connection with the cases of the *Winchelsea* and the *Liverpool*. Add. MSS. 24157. Grantham to Rochford (private and separate), 19 Sept., 1771, enclosing a letter from Don N. Bucareli y Urnia (governor of Cadiz), to Grimaldi, 10 Sept., 1771. *Ibid.* Rochford to Grantham, 11 Oct., 1771. *Ibid.* Rochford to Grantham, 25 Oct., 1771. S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 9 March, 1772. *Ibid.* Grantham to Proconsul Dalrymple, 10 March, 1772 (enclosed in Grantham to Rochford, 13 March, 1772).

English commander would follow the Spanish ship into Boca Chica Road his needs would be attended to. In the darkness which soon afterwards came on, either from accident or design, the *guarda costa* was lost sight of and on the twenty-eighth the needed fuel and water were secured when the vessel reached the island of Rosarios. Three days later, while on the return journey to Jamaica, the *Sir Edward Hawke* was overtaken by two Spanish *guarda costas* bearing orders to compel the English vessel to enter the harbor of Cartagena "at all events". While protesting that his ship was a "king's ship", Gibbs refused to show his commission and finally, without open resistance, followed the *guarda costas* into the Spanish port. When he had satisfied a Spanish officer sent by the governor that his ship was an armed vessel by exhibiting his commission he was informed that he was free to leave when he pleased but not to presume to come within twelve leagues of the coast, for if he was met with he and his crew would be taken prisoners.²⁹⁵ Immediately upon the return of the *Sir Edward Hawke* to Jamaica a court martial dismissed Gibbs from the service on the charge of "disobedience of orders and suffering His Majesty's colours to be insulted and disgraced by two Spanish *guarda costas* whom he was prevailed on by threats to accompany into the harbour of Cartagena without making any resistance notwithstanding his orders were to keep a good look-out that His Majesty's vessel might not be run into any kind of danger or His Majesty suffer any disgrace from the insults of the *guarda costas* by surprise or otherwise".²⁹⁶ At once upon the conclusion of the trial two armed vessels were despatched with a letter from the recently arrived commander-in-

²⁹⁵ S. P. Spain 188. Lieut. A. Gibbs to Captain Hay, 5 Aug., 1771. Enclosed in Rochford to Grantham, 1 Nov., 1771. *Ibid.* John Manuel Lombardon to La Sierra (governor of Cartagena), 6 Aug., 1771. Enclosed in Rochford to Grantham, 3 Dec., 1771. Relation of what happened at sea near Jabanilla the 23 July between the sloop the *Shepherdess* (La Pastora) commanded by Lieut. Don Franc. Ydiaquex and an English schooner which pretended to be a King's ship, but it did not appear to be so. . . . Sent by Governor La Sierra to Captain Hay, 7 August, 1771.

²⁹⁶ S. P. Spain 188. Minutes of a Court Martial held on board H. M. *Achilles* in Port Royal Harbor, Jamaica, Monday, 26 Aug., 1771. Enclosed by Rodney to Stephens, 4 Sept., 1771, and by Rochford to Grantham, 1 Nov., 1771.

chief of the British squadron at Jamaica, Sir George Rodney, to the governor of Cartagena with instructions to wait for an answer.

Before the arrival of these messengers, the Spanish authorities at Cartagena had already had their attention called to the seriousness of the step they had taken in interfering with a "king's ship". As Gibbs had been preparing to leave Cartagena, the British frigate *Carysfort*, under the command of Captain Hay, had anchored in Boca Chica Road. The two vessels had had a rendezvous and on the failure of the *Sir Edward Hawke* to appear, Captain Hay, fearing some accident, had sailed for Cartagena where his apprehensions were confirmed by observing the British ship within the Spanish port.²⁹⁷ While Gibbs returned to Jamaica, Hay remained to remonstrate with the governor of Cartagena.²⁹⁸ By the seventh of August he had received through the governor an account of the late proceedings from the commandant of the *guarda costas*. This emphasized the suspicious character of the movement of the *Sir Edward Hawke* when first met with by the Spanish ship which had induced the governor and commandant to believe that the vessel was not a king's ship but on the contrary was a trader engaged in illicit traffic on the Spanish Main. As soon as Gibbs' commission had been shown, the commandant pointed out, the vessel had been released and allowed to go free "notwithstanding the notice the captain of 'La Pastora' (one of the *guarda costas*) gave me of a secret and most certain intelligence he had received that the said schooner was loaded with dry goods in bales, liquors in casks, and sundry other things to sell upon our coasts". The twelve leagues threat complained of was declared to be "absolutely an untruth, at least in part, as he (the Spanish captain) only particularly expressed to the captain of the said schooner that if he should meet them in trading upon our coast he would bring him into port,

²⁹⁷ S. P. Spain 188. Captain Hay to Commodore Mackenzie (of the Jamaica Station), 6 Aug., 1771. Enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 1 Nov., 1771. (Previously enclosed by Rodney to Stephens, 4 Sept., 1771.)

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.* Captain William Hay to the Governor of Cartagena, 5 Aug., 1771. Enclosed by Rodney to Stephens, 4 Sept. 1771, and enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 1 Nov., 1771.

which under all the circumstances and especially under the intelligence he had could not be taken as an insult".²⁹⁹

Six weeks after the *Carysfort* had sailed with this reply the *Achilles* and *Guadaloupe* arrived before Cartagena with Rodney's letter to Governor Sierra. This despatch, a characteristic one of the period, expressed the admiral's astonishment at hearing, on his arrival to take over his new duties, that "two guarda costas under the pretended sanction of your Excellency's and the Commodore's orders had forced His Majesty's schooner the *Hawke* into Cartagena after they were told and knew whose commission the commander of her had the honour to bear". He was, moreover, informed, he wrote, that "one of the Commodore's lieutenants acquainted the Commander of the schooner on her dismissal from the port of Cartagena that he might go, but that if either the schooner or any other of His Britannic Majesty's ships were afterwards found within twelve leagues of that coast they should be taken and their crews imprisoned". . . . "As your Excellency, I doubt not, is equally disposed with myself to support the harmony which so happily subsists between the two crowns", wrote Rodney, "I cannot be persuaded that you have given the least countenance to these acts of violence". The officer who had dishonored the king's colors by a tame submission to an insult, Sierra was informed, had been dismissed the service and the admiral had the fullest confidence "that your Excellency on your part will immediately order the officers that have acted with such indignity to the British flag to be called to the strictest account and confirm the opinion I would willingly entertain of the impossibility of such a menace being sanctioned by the commodore or any officer of rank who wishes to preserve the general tranquillity."³⁰⁰

²⁹⁹ S. P. Spain 188. La Sierra (governor of Cartagena) to Captain William Hay of the *Carysfort*, 7 Aug., 1771, enclosing a letter from Dom Manuel Lombaradon, (commandant of *guarda costas*), to Governor Sierra, 6 Aug., 1771, which included a paper entitled the "Relation of What happened at Jabanilla, 23 July, between the sloop 'La Pastora' commanded by Lieut. Don Franc Ydiaguex and an English schooner which pretended to be a King's ship, but did not appear to be so." All three were forwarded by Rochford to Grantham, 3 Dec., 1771.

³⁰⁰ S. P. Spain 188. Admiral Rodney to Governor Sierra, 3 Sept., 1771. Copy enclosed to the Earl of Sandwich, 7 Oct., 1771. Enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 27 Dec., 1771.

To Admiral Rodney's letter, Governor Sierra replied that as the marine department of the *guarda costas* was separate from his command he had no part in the alleged insult, but had forwarded the admiral's letter to the commandant of the *guarda costas* whose answer he enclosed. The commandant in his letter refused a court martial on the double ground that he had not the authority to call one, and that his captains had committed no fault. The schooner, he repeated, had not been known to be a king's ship until it was in the harbor and its officer had been prevailed on to show his commission. The vessel had then been at once released. As there had been many prizes made upon that coast, English as well as French, which when at sea had pretended to be vessels of war, "their captains wearing uniforms and some of their sailors red coats in order to appear like soldiers", the suspicion in the case of the *Hawke*, the Spanish officer asserted, had been a very natural one.³⁰¹

As Lombardon's letter made no reference to the matter of greatest interest in the whole incident, the twelve leagues threat, Rodney despatched another cruiser with a letter addressed to the commandant himself. This epistle not only drew attention to the oversight, but entered into detail on the general question of the right of search as applicable to both war vessels and trading ships. "Frequent complaints", the admiral wrote, "were being made to him of trading ships being on the most slight and groundless pretences molested and searched by Spanish *guarda costas*" and he warned the commandant that he would "strenuously assert the freedom of our navigation and not suffer our merchant ships to be searched and the conduct of his officers so far questioned as to be forced to produce their commissions". As a sea officer, the admiral believed that the commandant must be sensible that ships from Jamaica bound to Curaçao and to the British Islands were frequently obliged to stretch near the continent and were not therefore from the mere circumstance of being found on the Spanish coast to be reasonably suspected of carrying

³⁰¹ S. P. Spain 188. Lombardon to La Sierra, 20 Sept., 1771. Sent by La Sierra to Rodney, 21 Sept., 1771. Both sent to Mr. Stephens by Rodney, 7 October, 1771, and by Rochford to Grantham, 27 December, 1771.

on an illegal trade. The letter concluded: "I must beg that you will give the strictest orders to the Guarda costas that they do not on such pretence only detain, search, or molest any ships or vessels belonging to His Britannic Majesty".³⁰²

Lombardon's reply was framed in most polite and conciliatory terms. All blame for the twelve leagues threat was cast upon the Portuguese interpreter of the schooner "whose falsity and extraordinary equivocation" was declared to be responsible for all the difficulties which had arisen. "So far from having mentioned any other of His Britannic Majesty's vessels, the *Hawke*", wrote Lombardon, "was the only one spoken of, telling the captain, (after having congratulated him upon his arrival and offered him very civilly everything he should have the occasion for both for himself and the vessel he commanded,) that as he had already whatever he wanted and nothing could detain him, he might go when he pleased, that if any guarda costa should meet him again within two leagues of the coast he would render himself suspicious of trading and would certainly be brought into port for being tried, this is in reality what was told him and not what the Portuguese interpreter said untruthfully and maliciously". " . . . To call twelve leagues the seacoast", Lombardon agreed would be "a great piece of madness and extravagancy". As to the notice regarding the complaints of merchant ships being searched and molested at sea by Spanish *guarda costas* the commandant wrote that it was the first he had ever had. He would reinforce his orders for remedying such an abuse if it existed and promised that "none should be searched unless they should be met at anchor upon the coast, or only at two leagues distance from it, as your Excellency must be sensible that those which come so near cannot be innocent". While

³⁰² S. P. Spain 188. Rodney to Lombardon, 9 Oct., 1771. A copy enclosed by Rodney to Stephens, 7 Oct., 1771, sent by Rochford to Grantham, 27 Dec., 1771.

In a letter to the secretary of the admiralty dated 19 Sept., 1771, Admiral Rodney refers again to the necessity of all ships from Jamaica to Curaçao "to touch nearly upon the Spanish Main" . . . and, added that British subjects trading between Jamaica and the Bay of Honduras were in the same case on their return journey from the bay, having frequently to "stretch as far as Cartagena before they can fetch the Island of Jamaica". Rodney to Stephens, 19 September, 1771. Enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 3 Dec., 1771.

agreeing that sometimes necessity drove vessels to make the land of the Spanish continent in their navigation, yet the Spanish officer maintained that "being so near they may be guilty and our commission becomes useless as well as the prohibition of clandestine trade if in such a case they should not be searched".³⁰³

When enclosing the correspondence over the incident to the admiralty, Rodney wrote that he could not help observing that the Spaniards' justification of their conduct in regard to the *Hawke* was founded on an "absolute falsehood" as the strictest scrutiny enabled him to "aver that the schooner had not any merchandise of any sort on board" but was "in obedience to the orders her commander was under proceeding in search of the *Carysfort*."³⁰⁴ That the Spaniards, however, were right in suspecting that the vessel's mission was not a wholly innocent one, even though they were wrong in believing her to be loaded with dry goods and liquors, is proved by a sworn statement made by Gibbs on his return to England and entitled "A memorandum of what Mr. Gibbs came voluntarily and related on Sunday morning, the twenty-fourth of November, 1771". In this the former commander of the *Sir Edward Hawke* declared that "had he been without any papers he would have surrendered himself as prisoner, but that he thought his papers would have been rummaged and the whole secret money transaction have come to light and all the Spaniards engaged in it would have been put in prison and tried for their lives". In this same document it appears that Mr. Mackenzie³⁰⁵ gave him orders to appear in every respect as a trading vessel by housing his guns, striking the yards and topmasts, etc".³⁰⁶

³⁰³ S. P. Spain 189. Lombardon to Rodney, 24 October, 1771. Enclosed by Rodney to Stephens, 4 December, and from the admiralty office sent to the Earl of Rochford, 24 February, 1772.

³⁰⁴ S. P. Spain 188. Rodney to Stephens, 15 and 19 September, 1771.

³⁰⁵ Commodore Mackenzie.

³⁰⁶ S. P. Spain 188. A memorandum of what Mr. Gibbs came voluntarily and related on Sunday morning, the 24 Nov., 1771.

Ibid. Hay to Mackenzie, 6 Aug., 1771, in Rodney to Stephens, 4 Sept., 1771, and Admiralty to Rochford, 1 Nov., 1771. The *Carysfort* made land off Pt. Canoe on the Spanish Main on 19 July and on the 21 was off the Fort. She remained in this position until the 3 August expecting to be joined by the *Sir Edward*

The first papers concerning the case were sent to Grantham at Madrid on the first of November with instructions to wait on Grimaldi and say that it was hoped that the commodore had already given satisfaction, properly punished the officers involved and disavowed "the absurd pretensions" of making prize of any of his majesty's ships found within twelve leagues of the coast as "the King is persuaded that His Catholic Majesty can have given no orders to authorize such indignities as must have an immediate tendency to interrupt the peace which so happily subsists at present".³⁰⁷ A month later, before the discussion could become serious at Madrid, the ambassador was advised that the insult of seizing a king's ship had been satisfactorily explained by the account from the commander of the *guarda costas* to Captain Hay in which the material circumstance of the commission not having been produced till the *Hawke* was in the harbor was made clear. The particular affair of the schooner was therefore considered at an end. As for the threat which the commandant admitted had been made, that if Gibbs were found trading on the coast, he would be brought in, the secretary of state observed that his majesty had recently given the court of Spain proof of his willingness to punish his officers found engaged in the contraband trade but that he "looked upon the correction of them as only belonging to himself and would not by any means admit such an indignity to his flag as the carrying by compulsion of any vessel bearing his commission into a Spanish port on any pretence whatever". The ambassador was instructed to inform the Spanish government that the commander-in-chief of his majesty's fleet in the West Indies had orders not to

Hawke. The latter's failure to appear caused the *Carysfort* to sail for Cartagena on 3 August. She arrived at Boca Chica on 4 August and from there could observe the missing vessel under the guns of the fort of Cartagena.

Ibid. Rodney to Stephens, 15 Sept., 1771. It is perhaps not without significance as to the mission of the two war vessels that shortly after the return of the *Carysfort* to Jamaica the merchants of that island had such a large quantity of money to remit to England that they made application to the admiral to allow the *Druid* to proceed to England some days before the sailing of the two frigates, *Carysfort* and *Dunkirk*, which were to carry the specie in order that their correspondents might have an opportunity of insuring the vessels.

³⁰⁷ Add. MSS 24157. Rochford to Grantham, 1 Nov., 1771.

suffer the king's ships to submit to such treatment in any case whatever and was to make the Spanish court sensible of the consequences which must follow from this policy being attempted by Spain.³⁰⁸ Privately the secretary of state wrote Grantham that he would do himself infinite credit if he could prevail upon Grimaldi to tell him officially that orders would be sent to the governors in America not to make any attempt upon the king's ships, if they were found carrying on a contraband trade, on the ground that they relied on the British government's promise to give full satisfaction when their complaints were well founded.³⁰⁹ On December 26, Grantham was able to report that Grimaldi "saw that we were in earnest and had informed him that orders restraining governors and officers in America from meddling with British ships of war were made out and would be forwarded by the next boat".³¹⁰

The right of search as applicable to trading vessels was not made a subject of discussion between the two courts in connection with the case of the *Sir Edward Hawke* but was raised in the same month of December, 1771, in relation to a New York trading sloop bearing the name of *Hawke*. This vessel, returning from a voyage to Curaçao, had found itself, when five leagues off the coast of Hispaniola, stopped by shots from a *guarda costa* and taken into port where it was subjected to a rigorous search and not permitted to leave until its master had paid a heavy exaction on no other account than not having submitted immediately to the visit. In stating the case to Grantham, Rochford remarked that the capture of the two vessels at such a distance from land gave reason to suppose that the Spaniards were pursuing a general plan. There could be no pretense by treaty, the secretary of state wrote, for such a visit and his majesty would never allow it to be exercised on the ships of his subjects pursuing their lawful navigation. Spain was, however, to be allowed to put the payment of the reparation demanded on any ground she pleased.³¹¹

³⁰⁸ S. P. Spain 188. Rochford to Grantham, 3 Dec., 1771.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.* Secret and private, 3 Dec., 1771.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.* Grantham to Rochford, 26 Dec., 1771.

³¹¹ S. P. Spain 188. Rochford to Grantham, 3 and 27 Dec., 1771. *Ibid.* Office of Grantham to Grimaldi, 24 Dec., 1771, enclosed by Grantham to Rochford, 26 Dec., 1771.

The ambassador was not to insist on any declaration that Spanish vessels would not visit British ships beyond a limited distance from the coast. Such a fixed rule, whose existence would condemn all ships found within the stipulated space, was the last thing the British desired. It was far more advantageous to cling to the old practice of insisting that on the high seas no pretense served to warrant the searching of their vessels while on the coast the mere presence there was not a sufficient excuse.³¹² Discussed intermittently through the following year, the case of the trading sloop *Hawke*, unlike that of its namesake of the war service, remained without a satisfactory termination, proving the greater effectiveness of the method pursued by the navy in securing a desired end.

Lord Grantham, summing up, at the close of 1771, the impression which his first months of duty in Spain had left upon his mind, wrote that while he did not "suspect any plan of hostile intentions to have prevailed at any time since the late accommodation" he could not in the present situation of affairs "flatter himself with any real cordiality towards us".³¹³ This description of the relations of the two powers applied with as much force to 1772 as to the first year after Prince Masserano's Declaration. Spain continued to occupy through the greater part of 1772 the isolated position in the diplomatic world in which the Falkland crisis had left her and the direct relations of England and Spain fell for the most part outside the main current of European events and were chiefly of a commercial character. One legacy of the

³¹² S. P. Spain 190. Rochford to Grantham, 15 May, 1772. In this letter Rochford gave details of the case of the British sloop *Adventure* which had been forcibly searched by a Spanish *guarda costa* "six leagues from St. Vincent and consequently at a much greater distance from any Spanish dominion". After remarking that "we can never permit armed vessels from the Spanish coast to cruise among our islands and search and examine our vessels and interrupt their trade", Rochford instructed the ambassador "if any apology should be attempted to you from the suspicions of a design of contraband trade you will declare it to be totally inadmissible since, exclusive of our constant denial of any right of the Spaniards to seize our vessels at open sea, even on the Spanish coasts on any suspicion whatever, the place where this happened determines the injustice of the act beyond the possibility of a dispute".

³¹³ Add. MSS. 24157. Grantham to Rochford, private and most secret, 12 Dec., 1771.

late crisis had been the realization that in the last analysis Spain could depend only upon her own resources. Charles III. and his government had in consequence naturally turned with redoubled vigor to the task of the economic development of the peninsula. Through 1771 this movement had principally taken the form of restrictions on the contraband trade carried on through the medium of foreign war vessels. The large measure of success which rewarded efforts in this direction encouraged advance along another line of the general movement whose aim was the encouragement of home industry and the reduction of foreign commerce in the peninsula. An order issued at the close of 1771, prohibiting the importation for use in continental Spain of all cotton manufactures, including Manchester products, aroused, in the possibilities of development which it seemed to open, as widespread consternation among the British merchants as the ban on the former privileges of the warships had among the sailors. "The system of this country changes apace, agriculture and manufactures is now their favourite plan", complained the British consul at Cadiz to Lord Rochford in December, 1771, "should they go on prohibiting the produce of England as they have done in the printed linen and cotton goods, your Excellency knows the consequence".³¹⁴ Grantham's protests that the new measure notoriously affected British trade very adversely and could not be looked upon except as a very unfriendly measure and contrary to the treaties which permitted the importation of English produce and manufactures subject only to the known duties were replied to by Grimaldi in words which imputed the measure as solely due to the legitimate policy of encouraging Spanish manufacture, pointed out for the greater comfort of the English that the French were even more seriously affected and closed with the observation that the British manufacturers "would not want a vent as they would clandestinely find their way to the coasts of America".³¹⁵ The most the ambassador was

³¹⁴ S. P. Spain 188. Dalrymple to Rochford, 20 Dec., 1771.

³¹⁵ S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 13 Feb., 1772. Add. MSS. 36806. Letters to Viscount Mountstuart, Ambassador to Spain, 1783-1784. *Memorial of British Merchants trading to Spain to Lord Grantham, one of H. M.'s principal*

able to secure after repeated renewals of his protest was the concession that goods which could be proved to have been shipped before the notice of the publication of the edict could have reached the shipper would be admitted and three months after their arrival allowed for their sale, while the expectation was held out that at the close of the twenty months mentioned in the edict as the period during which foreign cotton goods might lawfully be worn a further extension of time would be connived at.³¹⁶

Early in January, 1772, while the controversy over the admission of foreign cotton goods was at its height an order was issued to prevent foreign goods of any kind from being shipped in the *flota* to the Indies.³¹⁷ As English and French goods were usually each of greater value in the total of every *flota* than the Spanish goods shipped, the merchants of these nations felt especially aggrieved, Italians and Germans, whose supplies equaled the value of the Spanish, were not far behind in their lamentations while the Flemings and the Dutch were also affected.³¹⁸ The French, more deeply concerned than others, were the first to take action. The Duke D'Aiguillon who was reported to "feel a good deal of pique at the intention of the court of Spain to exclude all foreigners from having any share in their trade to the West Indies as well as contempt at their impotence

secretaries of State, 22 Jan., 1783. (A printed pamphlet.) "While Spain has endeavoured to defend its conduct respecting the prohibitions here stated [among others referred to is that against printed linens and cottons] on the principle that it is by the internal and general laws of the land which that government has the right to vary and not by any partial restriction on British trade, it is notorious that such innovations originated in the express and positive intention of breaking off particular branches of trade, which Great Britain had the peculiar means of furnishing and which could not be had in any other country."

³¹⁶ S. P. Spain 190. Grantham to Rochford, 21 May, 1772, enclosing letters from Grantham to M. Musquiz and Musquiz to Grantham.

³¹⁷ S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 23 Jan. 1772.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.* Dalrymple to Rochford, 27 March, 1772. The pro-consul at Cadiz in this letter gave a fairly full account of the *flota* which was then preparing to sail for the Indies in the following May with the expectation of arriving at Vera Cruz in the succeeding August. It would, he said, consist of two ships of war, thirteen merchant ships, and an auxiliary gun ship, the latter to carry goods which the merchant ships found themselves unable to load. In all some 3,150

to carry such a project into execution"³¹⁹ sent such instructions to the French ambassador at Madrid as caused him to make sufficiently strenuous representations to the Spanish government to induce it to remove the prohibition in time to allow foreign goods to be embarked as usual in the spring *flota*.³²⁰

In America, as in Europe, the year 1772 was a period of unusual quiet in the relations of the two powers. Spain's absorption in domestic matters inclined her to peace abroad, while the explosive conditions in Europe induced both nations to make unusual efforts to prevent the occurrence of major incidents. Admiral Rodney reported from Jamaica in January that, since the affair of the *Sir Edward Hawke*, the Spanish *guarda costas* had been

seamen would be employed. The whole cargo was estimated to be worth 19,784,327 dollars. Of this amount

Products of France	were estimated at	\$7,250,000
" " England	" " "	3,000,000
" " Spain	" " "	2,500,000
" " Italy	" " "	2,500,000
" " Germany	" " "	2,000,000
" " Flanders	" " "	1,500,000
" " Holland	" " "	750,000
" " Sundry	" " "	284,000

Total	\$19,784,000
-------	--------------

The benefits which would accrue to the crown of Spain from the *flota* were estimated as follows:

Duty accruing on 15 millions of foreign goods	\$1,500,000
Duty outward on goods shipped at 10%	1,000,000
Licenses of 13 merchant ships	390,000

\$2,890,000

Duty homeward on 20 million dollars at 9%	\$2,400,000
Freight of 20 million dollars brought home at 3%	800,000

\$6,090,000

Total

Three months would be required for the unloading of the merchant ships after which these vessels would return to Cadiz mostly in ballast. About the middle of 1773, the rear admiral would sail from Vera Cruz and bring home two-thirds of the returns of the *flota*. A later letter mentions May the twenty-ninth as the date on which the *flota* actually sailed. S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 4 June, 1772.

³¹⁹ Add. MSS. 24158. Rochford to Grantham, 25 Feb., 1772.

³²⁰ S. P. Spain 189. Grantham to Rochford, 9 March, 1772.

very quiet.³²¹ He had indeed been informed, he wrote, of the capture of eight English sloops discovered by the Spaniards while engaged in loading timber on the south coast of Cuba, but, as the owners of the vessels admitted that the trade was an illegal one, he had refused to intervene. In the middle of the following summer he informed the admiralty that in making an application for the return of a vessel captured by the Spaniards and carried to Vera Cruz two years earlier he had forwarded his complaint by way of Honduras "having considered that the sending a man-of-war to Vera Cruz might have been productive of disagreeable consequences, the Spanish governors in this part of the world being too apt to insult His Majesty's colours when his ships attempt to enter their ports".³²² In the one American incident of the year on which official diplomatic protest was made, the case of the British sloop *Adventure* captured by a Spanish *guarda costa* while on a journey between Antigua and Grenada, the Spanish court showed itself disposed to take every step to satisfy the British government.³²³

Throughout 1772 and 1773, while colonial issues continued to recede further and further into the background, the English ministry watched with careful attention the relations of Spain to the other courts of Europe, constantly on guard lest this Bourbon power should abandon her isolation and assume an active part in the great events which were absorbing the attention of the rest of Europe. It was felt that the triple alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, with its fatal consequences to Polish national existence and its threat to Swedish independence could not leave any European Power long in indifference. Grantham's reports that the Spanish government "betrayed much discontent" when it learnt that Vienna meant to share in the spoils of a divided Poland, evidently made anxious by the discovery that "it seemed a very easy matter for great Powers to stoop and pick up

³²¹ S. P. Spain 189. Rodney to Stephens, 29 Jan., 1772 (sent by Hillsborough to Rochford, 27 March, 1772).

³²² Add. MSS. 24158. Rodney to Stephens, 5 July, 1772 (enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 25 Sept., 1772).

³²³ S. P. Spain 190. Rochford to Grantham, 15 May, 1772. *Ibid.* Grantham to Rochford, 4 June, 1772.

what they pleased of the shares of smaller states''³²⁴ were read with the greatest attention as likewise was the ambassador's account of the warm reception of the news of the Swedish revolution at the Spanish capital.³²⁵ While the king distinguished the Swedish and French ambassadors with unusual attention and Grimaldi openly remarked that if he were the French minister he would be highly pleased at the development as it gave added strength to an ally, Grantham wrote that the Spanish minister seemed well aware that England would take an active part if France set the example by lending open help to Sweden, but did not appear to consider that Spain was bound to assist France in such an outbreak. "Upon the whole", the Englishman concluded "this court is very sensible of the affairs of Europe being in a very critical situation and of the inevitable extension of the flame in case any power should depart from the neutrality observed at present and unwilling that such an event should happen".³²⁶

As the union of Russia, Austria, and Prussia became more alarming and the Swedish affairs increased in international importance the relations between the French and Spanish courts tended to become progressively warmer. In the autumn of 1772 the two courts were believed to have under consideration a scheme of a joint declaration to Russia to compel her to withdraw her fleet from the Mediterranean and it was alleged that Spain under guise of preparing for a Moroccan war was arming with a

³²⁴ Add. MSS. 24174. Grantham to Rochford, 6 August, 1772. Two months later (8 Oct., 1772), Grantham wrote: "This led him (Grimaldi) to talk again of the partition of Poland with much discontent, and indeed I find the measure has given the greatest disgust here."

³²⁵ The news of the Swedish revolution of the 19 and 20 August reached Madrid on the 11th of the following month. Grantham wrote that there was no doubt but that the intelligence gave the greatest satisfaction in Madrid. Add. MSS. 24174, Grantham to Rochford, 17 Sept., 1772.

³²⁶ Add. MSS. 24158, Rochford to Grantham, 13 October, 1772. Rochford wrote "If M. Grimaldi should speak to your Excellency on the consequences of Russia's attacking Sweden, you may from yourself assure him that you know we will do every proper thing in our power to discourage Russia, from such an attempt, but that if she persists and France in consequence of it sends a fleet we cannot in that case remain idle spectators." On November 9, 1772, Grantham wrote to Rochford (Add. MSS. 24174, copy) that "there was a report and strongly believed

view to putting herself in a position to make the declaration.³²⁷ By the close of the year Spanish military reorganization and preparations had become very noticeable, Grantham writing that he had reason to think that if called upon their army could be got ready with alacrity.³²⁸ It was evident that Spain, seeing the rest of Europe an armed camp, considered it dangerous to remain longer absorbed in the domestic problems to which she had turned after her dispute with England, and believed that only observation, vigilance, and readiness constituted a policy consistent with national security.³²⁹

The crisis of the year 1773 came in April when there seemed great likelihood that Russia would carry her arms into Sweden. This action, Rochford thought, would force Sweden to call for the aid of France and lead the latter to desire Spain to make common cause. He wrote to Grantham that the king "would never see the French or Spanish fleet at sea, separated or united, without

here that Spain had jointly with France declared their attention to support Sweden and act in concert on the subject. I am credibly informed that no such measure has been taken however France may have bragged of the certain concurrence of this court."

The following letter makes it clear that in Russia it was believed that while Spain refrained from affording military assistance to Sweden nevertheless that she supported the French policy in that country in another way: Add. MSS. 24159, R. Gunning to Grantham, St. Petersburg, 1/12 June, 1773. "This court [the Russian court] is extremely piqued and dissatisfied with those of France and Spain. They impute . . . the success of their opponents in Sweden to the money transmitted by Spain last summer which we are told amounted to 400,000 pounds sterling."

³²⁷ Add. MSS. 24158. Rochford to Grantham, 11 Sept., 1772.

³²⁸ Add. MSS. 24174, Grantham to Rochford, 8 Oct., 23 Nov., and 3 Dec., 1772.

³²⁹ *Ibid.* Grantham to Rochford, 29 March, 1773. "The language held here by the minister and the French ambassador is, that there is no faith left in public transactions; that nothing from the courts of Russia and Prussia is surprizing, but that the court of Russia is acting an ambitious and faithless part, which was not expected, that a stop to their union and progress might and ought to have been made at first, that at present the best system to be adopted was observation, vigilance, and readiness to step forth if necessary. And these are probably the reason of some steps now taking place here, such as orders for officers to join their respective corps at the beginning of next month, and preparations for a camp at Carthage which are very considerable. It is proposed to assemble these 22,000 men and great stores of artillery . . . and implements proper for a siege."

sending a force at least equal to theirs".³³⁰ Almost simultaneously with this despatch, information reached Grantham from Paris that orders had been given for a considerable armament at Toulon, to consist of twelve ships of the line and six frigates under the command of Count d'Estaing. Though officially declared by the French government to be merely "*une flotte d'évolution*", the British found it very difficult to suppose that a fleet equipped at this critical period and commanded by as distinguished and enterprising an officer should be intended merely to "parade in the Mediterranean and exercise the ships",³³¹ and early remonstrances were shortly followed by the announcement that the British government in consequence of the Toulon fleet had given orders that fifteen ships of the line should be fitted out and a proportionable number of stores should be made ready.³³² A dispatch from Rochford of April the twenty-third "taking notice of the alarming preparations making at Cartagena" instructed Grantham to give notice of the English armament to Grimaldi, but to "declare in a confidential manner that the armament is meant solely by way of precaution, it being impossible for His Majesty to see so considerable a fleet getting ready at Toulon without providing for the safety of his own dominions".³³³ Before these instructions had reached Madrid, the French on second considerations had suspended the greater part of the armament at Toulon and assurance had also been given the British government through Paris that the naval preparations at Cartagena were likewise countermanded.³³⁴ At Aranjuez, Grantham's interviews with Grimaldi disclosed a surprisingly full and intimate knowledge on the part of the Spanish government of the details of the French plans³³⁵ while the language

³³⁰ Add. MSS. 24159. Rochford to Grantham, 9 April, 1773.

³³¹ Add. MSS. 24159. Stormont (British ambassador at Paris) to Grantham, 10 April, 1773.

³³² *Ibid.* Rochford to Stormont, 20 April, 1773. Copy enclosed in Rochford to Grantham, 20 April, 1773.

³³³ *Ibid.* Rochford to Grantham, 23 April, 1773.

³³⁴ *Ibid.* Stormont to Grantham, 24 April, 1773.

³³⁵ Add. MSS. 24174. Grantham to Rochford, 27 April, 1773. The ambassador gathered from the conversation that Spain was "acquainted from the first with the intention of France to arm in defence of Sweden if the latter was attacked by

generally held was, the ambassador reported, that England "could have connived at the French expedition and that the cause of Russia did not deserve her interposition and assistance".

By the close of May positive declarations from Russia and Denmark to the court of Stockholm removed French apprehensions of an attack on Sweden and caused the French government to announce that the Toulon armament was not merely suspended but totally laid aside. In the letter which conveyed this intelligence to Grantham, Rochford remarked that it was "highly necessary to know whether the secret understanding between these two courts [France and Spain] would not lead Spain to undertake what France has given up upon the false opinion perhaps that we would be more easy at seeing an operation against the Russians by Spain than by France". While merely a guess this suspicion was strengthened, the secretary of state said, by the alarming state of the Spanish naval forces. He conjectured that "both France and Spain, quite apart from the Swedish affair are jealous of the increasing power of Russia and are willing to use every means to defeat the progress of the very formidable Triple Alliance". While an explanation of the readiness of the Spanish force could not be properly demanded officially, he suggested that Grantham should remark as from himself how much he should hate to see Great Britain arming on account of Spain.³³⁶ But despite every suggestion of possible unfortunate consequences activity in every branch of the Spanish military service continued. The arrival in June of a singular letter from the emperor of Morocco announcing that he would find himself obliged to advance against the Spanish North African post of Ceuta unless Charles III. delivered it into his hands³³⁷ provided the Spanish government with an excuse which served for the rest of the year

Russia, and that Spain looked upon France as bound to take that part, but he apprehended that by our arming was out of the question". Spain is not disposed to join France in defense of Sweden although he was sure that "they are determined to arm for the defence of France if France becomes liable upon our arming to be attacked".

³³⁶ Add. MSS. 24159. Rochford to Grantham, 28 May, 1773.

³³⁷ Add. MSS. 24174. Grantham to Rochford, 17 June, 1773. "The Emperor of Morocco has by means of a third person conveyed a most singular letter to His

for the maintenance of the heavy armaments which it thought fit to keep up.³³⁸

Through this year of military activity, as in the preceding twelve months, isolated incidents which crept into the correspondence between the Spanish and British courts were few in number. Grimaldi in August expressed his highest satisfaction at the few events which had happened for months in connection with contraband allowing their absence to be "entirely due to the good faith with which the English government discouraged the practice in America and in Europe".³³⁹ America offered nothing more serious than a renewal of the old plea that Spain should give some undertaking to discourage the protection offered in Spanish America to deserting slaves from the British dominions³⁴⁰ and should cease the practice of imprisoning in Europe British subjects arrested in America.³⁴¹

The first six months of 1774 constituted a period of greater calm in the relations of France, England, and Spain than had been known since the troubled seventies began. Relieved from the immediate prospect of war over the Swedish question and restrained by the activities of the menacing triple alliance and considerations of possible developments in the American colonial dispute which had commenced to assume large proportions, the three powers, while remaining armed, showed a real desire to enjoy a breathing space before resuming plans for active hostilities against each other.

Catholic Majesty in which after the strongest professions of his desire of peace, he states that the People of the Law will not allow him to leave Ceuta in the King of Spain's possession; that he has hitherto evaded their solicitations by feint marches and preparations, but is at last obliged to comply with their request and injunctions by acquainting the Catholic King, that unless Ceuta is delivered up he must proceed with force against it and adds a proposition that to prove how sincerely he desires to be on good terms with the crown of Spain, the war between them shall be carried on only by land, for that he will not interrupt their vessels and commerce by war."

³³⁸ *Ibid.* Porter (in absence of Lord Rochford) to Grantham, 21 Dec., 1773.

³³⁹ *Ibid.* Grantham to Rochford, 9 August, 1773.

³⁴⁰ Add. MSS. 24159. Rochford to Grantham, 16 July, 1773. With enclosures from the governor of Grenada. Add. MSS. 24174. Grantham to Rochford, 9 August, and 9 September, 1773.

³⁴¹ Add. MSS. 24159. Grimaldi to Grantham, 9 August, 1773.

In this period of unusual tranquillity the sovereignty of Crab Island became for the second time in two years a matter of diplomatic discussion between the English and Spanish courts, offering to the Bourbon powers, had they been in a mood to open their long premeditated war against England a feasible *casus belli*. The deserted island in question was one of the smaller West Indian islands lying off Porto Rico. An English officer who visited it described it as seven leagues in length with an eastern end low and barren but the remainder of rich soil and possessed of rivers and one fine harbor, as well as good anchorage anywhere to leeward. Other attractions were plenty of fish, at times turtles, and some wild fowl and vast quantities of crabs.³⁴²

In 1772, the island had been the scene of an exciting and disastrous encounter between a British merchant vessel from Jamaica, which had put into Crab Harbor for a supply of hardwood posts, and three Spanish vessels from Porto Rico. According to the English captain's account of the event his vessel had been "fired on and boarded by upwards of forty men, mostly negroes and mulattos, armed with pistols, cutlasses and large knives, who being enraged at resistance cut and wounded him and his people in a very cruel manner and after stripping them of everything carried them in that condition to Porto Rico where they were thrown into a dungeon and confined forty days destitute of clothes, almost starved and entirely deprived of the benefit of fresh air." When a war vessel despatched by Admiral Man had failed to secure redress from the governor of Porto Rico, who refused to restore the vessel or release the crew, on the ground that the latter had been found cutting wood on an island belonging to his Catholic majesty and would have to remain prisoners until a trial decided their fate, the matter had passed into diplomatic channels.³⁴³

Rochford, in despatching the papers to Grantham in June,

³⁴² S. P. Spain 190. Captain Corner of the *Crescent* to Admiral Man, St. George's Bay, Grenada, 28 Jan. 1772. (Copy enclosed in Hillsborough to Rochford, 18 June, 1772.)

³⁴³ Cf. A paper entitled "Narrative of the seizure of the schooner 'Betsy'" a copy of which Rochford enclosed to Grantham, 16 June, 1772. Add. MSS. 24158.

1772, had stated that he learned from the Plantation Office that the British had always considered Crab Island as belonging to Great Britain although it had at different times been contested by the Spaniards who had once or twice driven away the English frequenting it. In King William's time, the secretary said, the government, on a suspicion that the Spaniards intended to settle it, had sent instructions to the governor of the Leeward Islands not to suffer any foreign nation to establish themselves there and these orders had been constantly repeated. There was, however, Rochford had emphasized, no inclination to seek a quarrel over the property of an island on which the British had never thought it worth while to make an establishment and probably never would, and Grantham was therefore not to make a point of the sovereignty, but allow Spain to put the restitution demanded on any ground she pleased.³⁴⁴ The Spanish minister on being approached had pretended never to have heard of the English claim. He had remarked that the Danes and the French had more than once applied to the Spanish government to purchase it and that it had long been considered a Spanish possession. Since 1754, the governor of Porto Rico, he said, had been under particular orders to visit the island every four months and prevent foreign settlements upon it.³⁴⁵

While once or twice renewed, the matter had gradually been allowed to drop and nothing had been heard of it for some time when in April, 1774, Rochford received from Vice-Admiral Parry of the Leeward Islands station a copy of a correspondence which had recently passed between himself and the governor of Porto Rico. The latter had written that, knowing that Parry had five ships of war and some smaller vessels for the purpose of conducting a great number of families to Crab Island to take possession of it for Great Britain, he was sending an officer to protest as the island was attached to his captain-generalcy.³⁴⁶ Parry had returned the reply that the governor's information was

³⁴⁴ Add. MSS. 24158. Rochford to Grimaldi, 16 June, 1772.

³⁴⁵ S. P. Spain 190. Grantham to Rochford, 9 July, 1772.

³⁴⁶ Add. MSS. 24160. Don Miguel de Muesas (Governor of Porto Rico to Vice-Admiral Parry, 11 Feb., 1774. Copy enclosed by Rochford to Grantham, 19 April, 1774. Later Spanish advices informed Grimaldi that the English admiral had denied on the one hand any intention to settle the island and on the

erroneous since it was not necessary to take possession of an island that already belonged to the crown of Great Britain and was included in the government of the Leeward Islands.³⁴⁷ In informing Grantham of the incident Rochford wrote that if Grimaldi should remonstrate and insist on the sovereignty the ambassador should endeavor to convince him of his error and let him see that if a serious dispute should be entered into about the property of a place of so inconsiderable a value it would be owing to his court and would not correspond to the king's friendly endeavors to avoid it.³⁴⁸ Grimaldi brought the matter up, but so far from showing any desire to push it to extremes he informed the British ambassador that he did not consider that the admiral's move had been in consequence of particular orders, and that in order to prevent any disagreeable event he had sent orders the previous day to the governor of Porto Rico to suspend for a time his usual visit to Crab Island in order to avoid meeting the British there and that very soon his Catholic majesty would send proofs of his right to the island to the Spanish embassy in London with instructions to his representative to endeavor to convince the British government of the soundness of the Spanish claim.³⁴⁹ In June the British government informed Grimaldi that there was no thought of encouraging the establishment of a

other of being there by accident, his business there merely being to visit the island as one of the King of Great Britain's possessions. *Ibid.* Grantham to Rochford, 2 May, 1774.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.* Vice-Admiral Parry to the Governor of Porto Rico, 14 Feb., 1774. Copy enclosed in Rochford to Grantham, 19 April, 1774.

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.* Rochford to Grantham, 19 April, 1774.

³⁴⁹ Add. MSS. 24174. Rochford to Grantham, 2 May, 1774. "M. Grimaldi told me further . . . that from a thorough desire of preventing any eclat or disagreeable event in America, he had by the packet boat which was to go out yesterday for Coruña procured orders to be sent to the Governor of Porto Rico, to suspend for a time his usual visit to Crab Island in order to avoid meeting us there again for the present, at the same time not to slacken his observation upon any future visits on our parts, and he proceeded by saying that in the same spirit of preventing any open dispute, which is not immediately repeated, he would consider as null, he would answer M. Escarano [Spanish chargé d'affaires in England] by a speedy and secret opportunity and he would instruct him to talk to His Majesty's ministers in an amiable manner on this subject and that he should furnish him with materials which he looked upon as proofs of the Catholic King's right to the island."

British settlement upon the disputed island. With this the subject passed out of the correspondence of the period.³⁵⁰

The interest of the incident lay in the fact that in it the Spanish government was offered an opportunity, such as the Falkland incident had provided, to open the war with England, and, though heavily armed, declined it. The explanation of the difference between the action of 1770 and 1774 was undoubtedly to be found in the better comprehension at the Spanish court of the unreadiness of France to undertake active hostilities and the fuller understanding of the special disinclination of the French government to go to war over a matter arising from the relations of Spain with her English neighbor in America.

Hope was high in England at the beginning of the summer of 1774 that the months ahead would prove to be as free from serious disputes with the Bourbon powers as had been those of the first half of the year. Spain had just rejected, in the recent phase of the Crab Island incident, a possible excuse for opening hostilities and, while her armaments were alarming, her difficulties with Morocco offered an explanation, if a somewhat inadequate one, of them. In France, a new king had just ascended the throne whose strong assurance of a pacific disposition towards his neighbors was held to be proved by the appointment to the head of foreign affairs of M. Vergennes. This future champion of the cause of the disaffected English colonies, Rochford described to Grantham in June, 1774,³⁵¹ as "hitherto reckoned a man of business" not esteemed to be possessed of "shining talents" nor of "an enterprising disposition" but to be of "a calm and peaceable turn", characteristics which the English secretary of state declared he welcomed as "happy presages of peace" giving "reason to hope that the flames of war will not be soon extended to this side of Europe".

³⁵⁰ Add. MSS. 24160. Rochford to Grantham, 10 June, 1774. "I have in commission from His Majesty to repeat to your Excellency that there is not the least intention of encouraging any British subjects to settle at Crab Island and that he wishes to avoid reviving the discussion of the right of sovereignty to so inconsiderable a place."

³⁵¹ Add. MSS. 24160. Rochford to Grantham, 24 June, 1774.

CONCLUSION

In the period which has been under review in the present study, America occupied wholly different positions in the polity of the two nations whose relations have been the subject of investigation. To England, the New World represented the sphere of opportunity in which the political, military, and commercial successes of the first half of the eighteenth century spoke promisingly of rewards for further efforts. Every English settlement in America was a center of expanding activity; every English settler dreamed of the step beyond. In accordance with this spirit, treaty concessions, in frequent instances deliberately concluded in vague terms, were no sooner secured than the lands ceded were fully taken possession of and a dispute was in progress concerning the boundaries of the transferred title. To Spain, on the other hand, under Charles III., America did not represent a goal of national ambitions. These centered not in the New World but in the Old, where the conquest of Portugal and the regaining of Gibraltar were the dearest objects of the king's desires. In the pursuit of the dream of an all-Spanish peninsula in which, as under Philip II., a Spanish king would rule the land from the Pyrenees to the straits of Gibraltar, from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, America naturally played a very secondary rôle. The reign of the third Spanish Bourbon king saw indeed large tracts of new territory added to Spain's colonial empire, but these came rather incidentally in the train of other considerations and were not the result of any deliberate design on the part of the home government to increase Spain's American holdings. Beyond the wish to find defensible frontiers behind which he could hold what he had inherited of New World lands Charles' views of territorial expansion were confined to Europe.

On the conclusion of the Peace of Paris Spain was left the sole surviving rival of the English power in North and Central America. Within a few months of the signature of the treaty, English settlers stood on the furthestmost limits of the concessions which they had wrung from the Bourbon powers clearly ready for the next step forward. Mosquitia, Honduras Bay, West Florida, the Mississippi, constituted therefore, to the Spanish government

so many danger points where further advance either by active aggression or by peaceful penetration through contraband trade, must be guarded against. In the disputes, through the period, concerning these territories, the aim of the Spanish government was to confine within the narrowest limits the concessions which she had been obliged to make in the Treaty of Paris and to arrive at definite understandings in regard to boundary lines. These objects the British ministry consistently opposed.

Throughout the period, rumors of British exploratory operations along the Pacific coast and southward from the Lake of the Woods impelled energetic Spanish administrators like Gálvez of Mexico to push the line of Spanish claims westward and prevent the English from gaining a foothold to the west of the Spanish provinces. It was plain that if the British were successful on the Pacific coast Hispanic colonial enterprise was threatened with being hemmed in between two lines of advancing and ambitious English settlements.

English contraband activities which radiated chiefly from the British West Indies were met in the sixties and seventies of the eighteenth century on the part of Spain by a stiffening of old regulations enforcing the monopolistic theory of colonial commerce.

With the object of strengthening the military defenses, of guarding the frontiers against English advance, of pushing forward Spain's claims to lands threatened by English exploring activities and of enforcing the rules against contraband trade, the Spanish government immediately upon the close of the Seven Years' War sent a group of her ablest men to America. Having appointed these new colonial administrators, Charles III. characteristically gave his fullest confidence to their efforts. After 1766, when the new officials were securely in their offices and their reforms were well in progress, the king manifested very little fear of the result on his American dominions of a war with England. Having remedied the defects which the late war had shown to exist at Havana and Manila and placed able men in the other colonies, Charles put confidence in the new plans and refused to share his French ally's misgivings of possible ill consequences of a hostile attack.

Spain's readiness for a war with England and her confidence in the outcome of such hostilities became strikingly evident in the Falkland Island crisis of 1770. The respective claims of the two nations to these South Atlantic islands have already been discussed at length. The attempt at their settlement constituted a phase of the general interest in the exploration of the South Seas shown by all colonizing nations in the eighteenth century, but the proximity of the islands to the South American continent made any attempt at settlement upon them appear a threat to Spanish dominion in a part of the world which Spaniards regarded as peculiarly their own. Moreover, the possession by the English of a port for refreshment in the pathway of the long journey from the British Isles to the South Seas would, it was believed by the Spaniards, give encouragement and a local habitation to English exploring and contraband activities in the south Atlantic and along the Pacific shores where Spain's means of defending her American possessions were weakest. Rather than permit such a settlement Charles III. was willing to go to war and would have done so could he have secured the aid from France to which he considered himself entitled by the terms of the Family Compact. The attack on Port Egmont, though devised by one of the most energetic of the new governors sent to Spanish America, was confessedly not contrary to general orders from Madrid. Although the Spanish government officially declared that M. Bucareli had not acted in consequence of specific orders, the character of the assault made it clear to all the world that even the most enterprising governor would not have taken the responsibility involved upon himself without a firm assurance that he would have behind him the support of the home government. The terms of the declaration to which Spain was forced to agree in 1771 ostensibly left the question of the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands in the same position in which that matter had existed before M. Bucareli's expedition, but in the nature of things the ceremonial restoration of the British colony to Port Egmont strengthened the *de facto* position of the British in the islands. The possibility of further dispute was, however, removed for the rest of the century by the withdrawal of the British forces—on the ground of economy—in 1774.

The Falkland Island incident had an important effect on the relations of Spain to both France and England. Previous to the crisis of 1770, Charles III.'s government seemed unconscious of the staggering blow which the Seven Years' War had dealt to France. The Falkland episode brought disillusionment and the loss of Spain's best friend at the court of Louis XV. at the same time that it made the English ministry fully aware of the hostile sentiments which prevailed at the Spanish court. In consequence, the two years which followed Prince Masserano's declaration were years of diplomatic isolation for Spain. In these years Charles III. and his government gave their first attention to domestic affairs endeavoring to remedy an economic situation which condemned the native Spaniards to occupy a more unfavorable position in the commercial life of the Spanish peninsula than the subjects of any foreign power. The English accused the Spaniards of aiming, in their new regulations for Spanish import and export trade, particularly at the destruction of British mercantile interests and also considered that they were special objects of attack in the efforts made to put a stop to contraband trade in silver at the Spanish ports. At the close of a long controversy while the privileges of British warships in the more important Spanish European harbors were nominally considerably narrowed, the insistence of the English government on the literal interpretation of the terms of the treaty of 1767 robbed the Spanish measures of much of their effectiveness.

The privileges of British warships in the New World and the Old rested on fundamentally different bases. In continental Spain, British vessels had by treaty the right of entrance to the ports, and only their improper stay within the harbors would be questioned. In the New World, on the other hand, foreign war vessels could claim no rights of entrance except in cases of distress, and consequently controversies surrounding them bore fundamentally on the question of right of search at sea. In the case of the *Sir Edward Hawke*, which has been discussed at length above, the British government upheld, and the Spanish government virtually recognized, the contention that no pretense whatever might serve as an excuse for the search of a king's

ship once its character had been ascertained. The right of search in relation to trading vessels, however, continued through the period in question to remain in the same unsettled state in which it had been for above a century. The Spaniards made an effort in the case of the trading sloop, the *Hawke*, to settle upon some limited distance from the shore within which all trading ships could be considered as engaged in contraband traffic and subject to capture. Here, as in the case of land boundaries, England refused to consent to any definite agreement, and preferred to cling to the doctrine that on the high seas no excuse might serve as a reason for search while on the very coast of Spanish America mere presence could not be taken as evidence of contraband activities.

Towards the close of 1772, as European affairs became more threatening, Spain began to withdraw from her isolation and to return to warm relations with France, even going to the length of arming in support of her ally's Swedish policy. Through 1773 and 1774, while Europe remained an armed camp and the friendship of the Bourbon partners continued to grow stronger, disturbing incidents in Anglo-Spanish relations in America were very few in number. Both nations showed themselves sincerely desirous of avoiding complications in the New World during a period of so much uncertainty in European politics. The only controversy of any magnitude after the Falkland Island incident centered about Crab Island and this dispute is of interest chiefly from the fact that in it Spain was afforded an opportunity, such as the Falkland incident had provided, of beginning hostilities with England and that, drawing upon recent experience, she declined the opening.

The Crab Island incident marks the close of a decade in which the principal issues in the relations of England and Spain have been controversies and adjustments growing out of the Seven Years' War. As the changes effected by the Peace of Paris were for both England and Spain chiefly in the colonial sphere, so the predominating interest in the relations of the two powers in the decade succeeding the war is found in their American connections. With the last months of 1774, fresh issues, not primarily springing

from the late hostilities, come to the forefront. Spain becomes absorbed in a Moroccan war and a renewal of her disputes with Portugal, while England's attention becomes daily more fixed upon the troubles within her own colonial dominions. With the advent of these new issues as primary factors in the relations of the two nations, a new chapter in their history begins.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Manuscript

State Papers. Foreign. Spain. 165-187. Consisting of the correspondence (with enclosures) of the British ambassadors at Madrid (the Earl of Rochford, Mr. De Visme, Sir James Grey, and Mr. James Harris) with the Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1769-1771.

State Papers. Foreign. Spain. 188-208. Consisting of the correspondence (with enclosures) of Thomas Robinson, 2nd Lord Grantham, with the Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1771-1779. (The letters to Grantham in this collection are copies of the originals preserved in the British Museum.) Nos. 188-196 are those which cover the period of the present study.

Additional MSS. 24157-24179. Correspondence of Thomas Robinson, 2nd Lord Grantham, as ambassador to Spain, 1771-1779. (The letters addressed to Grantham in this collection are originals, those from him, copies.)

State Papers. Foreign. Spain Supplementary. 253-254. (1761-1780.) These papers are not letters exchanged between the home government and the British representatives in Spain, but consist of miscellaneous papers bearing on matters of interest in the relations of the two powers, such as the correspondence of the British government with the English officials in charge of Port Egmont in the Falkland Islands.

State Papers. Foreign. Entry Books. Spain. 145-150. (1760-1770.)

State Papers. Foreign. Foreign Ministers (in England). 59. (1737-1780.)

State Papers. Foreign. France. 261-292. Consisting of the correspondence of the British representatives at the French court (the Earl of Hertford, the Duke of Richmond, Lord Lennox, the Earl of Rochford, Robert Walpole, and Lord Stormont) with the secretary of state for the Southern Department through the years 1764-1774. Vols. 271-273 are of special importance as they contain the correspondence of the Earl of Rochford with the Earl of Shelburne, 1766-1767.

State Papers. Foreign. Germany (Empire). 200-212. Containing the correspondence of the Secretary of State for the Northern Department with Lord Stormont, the British ambassador at the court of Vienna. (1764-1772).

Additional MSS. 355. Hardwicke Papers 152. Diplomatic Letter book of Lord Stormont, vol. I., 1763-1771.

Colonial Office Papers. (Largely the correspondence of the secretary of state with governors, military commanders, and other officials in the West Indies and other American settlements.)

America and the West Indies, C O 5	{ for the years 1763-1774.
Bahamas, C O 23	
British Honduras, C O 123	

Admiralty Papers. Ad. I. 238-239, consisting of the letters from the commanding officers on the Jamaica station (Admirals Burnaby and Parry, Commodores Forrest and Mackenzie, and Admiral Rodney) to the secretary of the admiralty, 1763-1774. Ad. II. 90-99, 536-548 consisting of out-letters, instructions, etc., from the admiralty to the admirals on the Jamaica station, 1763-1774.

B. Printed

(Anson, George.) *A Voyage round the world in the year MDCCXL*, I, II, III, IV, compiled from papers and other materials of the Right Honourable George Lord Anson and published under his direction by Richard Walter, Chaplain of H. M. Ship the Centurion in that expedition. 4 vols. Dublin, 1748.

(Bedford.) *Correspondence of John, 4th Duke of Bedford.* Introduction by Russell (John, Lord), 3 vols. London, 1842-46. *Private Journal of John, Duke of Bedford.* London, 1841.

Besénval, M. le baron de. *Mémoires.* Ed., Viscount Ségur, 4 vols. Paris, 1805-07. The family of Baron de Besénval has declared these memoirs not to be authentic.

*Blart, Louis. *Les Rapports de la France et de l'Espagne après le pacte de famille jusqu'à la fin du ministère du Duc de Choiseul.* Bibliothèque de Faculté des Lettres. Université de Paris. No. 32. Paris, 1915.

*Burney, James. *A Chronological History of the Voyages and Discoveries in the South Sea or Pacific Ocean.* 5 vols. London 1803-17.

(Byron.) *A Voyage round the World in H. M. ship "Dolphin" commanded by . . . Commodore Byron by an officer on board the said ship.* London, 1767.

——— *Terra Australia Cognita or Voyages to the Terra Australis or Southern Hemisphere during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries*, compiled by J. Callendar. Edinburgh, 1766. Extract from an account of Mr. Byron's Voyage appears in vol. III.

Candillo, A. del. *Tratados convenios y declaraciones de paz y de comercio. Puestos en orden e ilustrados con la historia de sus respectivas negociaciones.* Madrid, 1843.

Chalmers, G. *A Collection of Treaties between Great Britain and other Powers.* 2 vols. London, 1790.

Choiseul-Stainville. *Mémoires de . . .* Ed. F. Calmettes. Paris, 1904.

Cobbett, W., and Wright, J. *Parliamentary History of England.* Vols. 16 and 17.

Convencion entre el Rey nuestro Señor y el Rey Christianissimo sobre navegacion, comercio maritimo, y visitas de embarcaciones ajustada y firmada en Madrid à 2 de Enero, 1768. Madrid, 1788.

(Falkland Islands.) *Papers relative to the late negotiation with Spain and the taking of Falkland's Island from the English.* State Papers. London, 1771.

- * Flammermont, J., *Le Chancelier Maupeou et les Parlements*. Paris, 1884.
 (Florida and Louisiana.) *Documentos históricos de la Florida y la Luisiana, siglos XVI al XVIII*. (Biblioteca de los Americanistas, tom. 5.) Madrid, 1912.
- (George III.) *The Correspondence of King George III with Lord North (1768-1783)*. Ed., W. B. Donne. 2 vols. London, 1867.
- (Harris, James.) *Diaries and correspondence of James Harris, First Earl of Malmesbury*. Ed., the third Earl of Malmesbury. 4 vols. London, 1844.
 ——— *A Series of Letters of the First Earl of Malmesbury*. Ed. by his grandson. 2 vols. London, 1870.
- Harris, William. *A complete collection of all the Marine Treaties subsisting between Great Britain and France, Spain, etc.* 1779.
- Hertslet, Sir E. *Treaties and Tariffs regulating the trade between Great Britain and Foreign Nations*. (Spain) 7 vols. London, 1875-91.
- Lansdowne MSS. *Report III of the Royal Historical Commission*.
- (Louis XV.) *Correspondance secrète inédite de Louis XV . . . et autres documents*. Ed., E. Boutaric. Paris, 1866.
 ——— *The King's Secret being the secret correspondence of Louis XV with his diplomatic agents from 1752-1774*. Ed., J. V. A. de Broglie. 2 vols. London, 1879.
- (Louisiana.) *Real decreto que previene las reglas y condiciones con que se puede hacer el comercio desde España á la provincia de la Luisiana (23 Marzo, 1768)*. Madrid, 1768.
 ——— *Vue de la colonie Espagnole du Mississipi en l'année 1802 par un Observateur Résident sur les lieux*. Paris, 1803.
- Martens, G. F. von. *Recueil des principaux traités d'alliance de paix de trêve, de neutralité, de commerce, de limites, d'échange, etc., conclus par les puissances et états dans d'autres parties du monde depuis 1761 jusqu'à présent*. Gottingue, 1791-1801.
- (Mercy-Argenteau.) *Correspondance secrète entre Marie-Thérèse et le Comte de Mercy-Argenteau*. Ed., Arneth, A. von, et Geoffroy, A. 3 vols. Paris, 1874. Covers the period, April, 1770-November, 1780.
 ——— *Correspondance secrète du Comte de Mercy-Argenteau avec l'Empereur Joseph II et le Prince de Kaunitz*. Ed., Arneth, A. von, et Flammermont, J. 2 vols. Paris, 1889-1891. The text covers the period, Dec., 1780-Oct., 1790, but the appendix supplies the letters of the period, July, 1766-November, 1780.
- Morel-Fatio, A. *Recueil des Instructions données aux ambassadeurs de la France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la révolution française*. Vols. 11, 12, 12 bis, Espagne. Introduction and notes by Morel-Fatio, A., 1894.
- Penrose, B. *An account of the last expedition to Port Egmont in Falkland's Islands in the year 1772. Together with the transactions of the company of the Penguin shallop during their stay there*. London, 1775.
- Pernety, A. J. *Journal historique d'un Voyage fait aux Isles Malouines en 1763 & 1764, . . . et de deux voyages au Détroit de Magellan, avec une relation sur les Patagons*. Berlin, 1769. Published in Paris, 1770, under the title, *Histoire d'un voyage aux Isles Malouines, fait en 1763 & 1764*. Trans-

- lated and published in London, 1771, under the title, *The History of a Voyage to the Malouine (or Falkland) Islands made in 1763 and 1764 under the command of M. de Bougainville, in order to form a settlement there: and of two voyages to the Straights of Magellan, with an Account of the Patagonians.* Pownall, Thomas. Two speeches on the late negotiations and convention with Spain. London, 1771.
- *Quesada, Vicente G. *Recuerdos de mi Vida Diplomática, Mision en Estados Unidos, 1885-1892.* Buenos Aires, 1904.
- Robertson, James A. *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States, 1785-1807.* 2 vols. Cleveland, 1911.
- *(Shelburne.) *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne, afterwards First Marquis of Lansdowne, with extracts from his papers.* E. G. P. Fitzmaurice. 3 vols. London, 1875-76. Revised, 1912.
- Walpole, Horace. *Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third.* Ed., R. Bentley. 4 vols. London, 1845.
- *Letters of Sir Horace Walpole, Fourth Earl of Orford.* Ed., Peter Cunningham. 9 vols. London, 1891.
- *The last Journals of Horace Walpole during the reign of George III, (1771-1783).* Ed., A. Francis Steuart. 2 vols. New York, 1910.
- * These works have been chiefly used, in the preparation of the present study, for the large number of original documents which they contain, and consequently they are here placed among "printed sources".

SECONDARY WORKS

- Addison, J. *Charles the Third of Spain.* Oxford, 1900.
- Bancroft, H. H. *History of the Pacific States of North America.* 34 vols. San Francisco, 1882-90.
- *History of Mexico.* New York, 1914.
- Barrow, Sir J. *Life of George, Lord Anson.* London, 1839.
- Bolton, H. E. *Texas in the middle Eighteenth Century.* Berkeley, 1915.
- Bolton, H. E., and Marshall, T. M. *The Colonization of North America, 1492-1783,* New York, 1920.
- Bourget, A. *Le Duc de Choiseul et l'Alliance Espagnole.* Paris, 1906.
- *Etudes sur la politique étrangère du duc de Choiseul.* Paris, 1907.
- Bristowe, L. W. *Handbook of British Honduras.* Edinburgh, 1890.
- Burrows, M. *History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain.* Edinburgh and London, 1895.
- Chapman, C. E. *The Founding of Spanish California, the northwestward expansion of New Spain, 1687-1783.* New York, 1916.
- *A History of Spain.* New York, 1918.
- Clowes, W. L. *The Royal Navy.* London, 1898.
- Coxe, W. *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon.* 3 vols. London, 1813.
- Danvila y Collado, M. *Reinado de Carlos III, constituting vols. 1-6 of the Historia de España, ed., A. Canovas del Castillo.* Madrid, 1893-96.
- Daubigny, E. *Choiseul et la France d'outre-mer après le Traité de Paris.* Paris, 1892.

- España e Inglaterra. Estudio de sus relaciones históricas. Madrid, 1918.
- (Falkland Islands.) Some Account of the Falkland Islands to which is added a preliminary sketch for the formation of a Chartered Company to be called The Falkland Island Company. Second edition. London, 1851. Containing an excellent map of the Islands as "surveyed by Captain Robert Fitzroy, Captain William Robinson, Captain Barth of Sullivan with latest editions to Dec. 1748."
- Ferrer del Rio, A. Historia del reinado de Carlos III en España. 4 vols. Madrid, 1856.
- Fitzmaurice, E. G. P. Life of William, Earl of Shelburne, afterwards First Marquis of Lansdowne. 3 vols. London, 1875-76.
- Gibbs, A. R. British Honduras. London, 1883.
- Gutiérrez de los Rios, C. J., (Count de Fernán Núñez) Vida de Carlos III. 2 vols. Madrid, 1898.
- Hall, Hubert Pitt and the Family Compact. Quarterly Review, Oct., 1899.
- Haring, C. H. Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies in the time of the Hapsburgs. Cambridge, 1918.
- Hertz (Hurst), G. B. British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1908.
- Hume, Martin. Spain, its Greatness and Decay, 1479-1788. Oxford, 1906.
- Johnson, Samuel. Thoughts on the late Transactions respecting Falkland's Islands. London, 1771.
- Lafuente, M. Historia general de España desde los tiempos mas remotas hasta nuestros días. 30 vols. Madrid, 1850-67.
- Mahan, A. T. The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783. Boston, 1890.
- Maldonado, M. J. España y Francia en el siglo XVIII. Madrid, 1886.
- Marfil Garcia, M. Relaciones entre España y la Gran Bretaña desde las Paces de Utrecht hasta nuestros días. Madrid, 1907.
- Marks, M. A. M. England and America, 1763-1783. 2 vols. London, 1907.
- Priestley, H. I. José de Galvez, Visitor-General of New Spain. Berkeley, 1916.
- Reflexiones históricas sobre las relaciones entre España y Francia. Papeles Varios. 1808.
- Rousseau, F. Règne de Charles III d'Espagne, 1759-1788. 2 vols. Paris, 1907.
- Ruville, A. von. William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. 3 vols. New York, 1907.
- Shea, J. D. G. Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley. Albany, 1903.
- Shepherd, W. R. The Cession of Louisiana to Spain. Pol. Science Quart. XIX. 439-458.
- Snow, W. P. A Two Years' Cruise off Tierra del Fuego, the Falkland Islands, Patagonia, and in the River Plate. 2 vols. London, 1857.
- Soltau, R. H. The Duke de Choiseul. Oxford, 1909.
- Soulangue-Bodin, A. La Diplomatie de Louis XV et le Pacte de Famille. Paris, 1894.
- Spears, J. R., and Clark, A. H. A History of the Mississippi Valley from its discovery to the end of foreign domination. New York, 1903.
- Squier, E. G. Notes on Central America. New York. 1855.
- Wallace, J. History of Illinois and Louisiana under the French Rule. Cincinnati, 1893.
- Winship, A. E., and Wallace, R. W. The Louisiana Purchase. Chicago and New York, 1903.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mexico and its Reconstruction, by CHESTER LLOYD JONES. (New York D. Appleton & Co., 1922. \$3.50.)

Within the past few years so many books have been written on Mexico and so few of them treat comprehensively and fairly the many factors underlying the problems facing the government and peoples of our sister republic that Mr. Jones's contribution will be hailed by all students of Mexican affairs as one of the most valuable thus far offered. The volume is largely a study of interesting facts gleaned from official publications of both Mexico and the United States, supplemented by studies made by students of the Republic, both Mexican and foreign. The subject matter has been treated in an impartial manner by one who has a sympathetic understanding of the Mexican people and their institutions and who has endeavored to produce a work free from preconceived ideas and prejudices.

In his introduction the writer points out that in one volume it is impossible to give a detailed picture of the complex elements entering a study of this sort. He has endeavored to indicate the various factors which must be taken into consideration in forming an opinion of "what may fairly be expected of a government working under such conditions as will confront Mexico during its trying period of reconstruction". In this he has succeeded admirably.

Mr. Jones has not hesitated to criticise certain of the Mexican institutions, but his criticisms are not of the "reformer" type, but rather of an analytical observer who is endeavoring to give a true picture of applications of present and past systems and institutions. His praise of such of the institutions as justly merit praise, and of the praiseworthy characteristics of the Mexican, is unstinted.

In his opening chapter the writer points out "Why Mexico is a Problem" and continues with a chapter on the heterogeneous elements entering any analysis of the population of Mexico. Three chapters are devoted to the government of Mexico and three to Mexican finance, sketching in a brief but comprehensive manner certain of the more important features of both these subjects. A fairly complete and interestingly detailed study is made of the Mexican laborer, his contract

with employers, wages and demands, and his opportunities. In the opinion of the reviewer the four chapters on this subject show Mr. Jones at his best. He has not only placed before the world certain interesting figures, but his discussion of the laborers' traits as formed by centuries of customs and molded by successive methods of overlordship gives a clear insight into one of the major reasons for the political unrest manifested during the last decade.

Chapters are also devoted to the internal development of commerce and industries, transportation, colonization, the foreign commerce, the status of the foreigner in Mexico and a brief history of border troubles and Mexican American relations.

RALPH H. ACKERMAN.

A History of California: The Spanish Period. By CHARLES E. CHAPMAN, PH.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921. Pp. x, 527. Maps and illus. \$5.00.)

Professor Chapman who has spent thirteen years in the study of California history, and has seen virtually every document bearing upon this field, presents here a synthesis designed to appeal to the general public. In order to accomplish this purpose he has accorded considerable space to interesting and even almost fantastic incident. He gives a popular and attractive account of the geography and the native races of California, dwells upon the lost opportunity of the Mongolians, takes considerable pains to show the bearing of portions of his narrative upon present-day problems and conditions, delineates fully and with delicate touch the character of the Spanish heroes who have made their contribution to California history, and does not hesitate to relate at some length the romance of Razánof and the beautiful Concepción Argüello. By these and similar methods he seeks to entice the reader, as it were, to dip into the more serious and heavy parts of the narrative where he may acquire new facts and a broader and more profound understanding of this portion of the North American continent, where he may behold California history "in its proper perspective" and be convinced that California has a "great deal more to contribute to the cherished traditions of the American people" than heretofore has been indicated.

Whether the author has set forth this scholarly and reliable account of California history in such a fashion as to grip and hold the attention of the popular reader the future alone can decide. The task is by no means an easy one, although it should be, as Professor Chapman

believes," the ultimate aim . . . of all historical scholarship". Whatever the attitude of the public for which the author entertains such generous regard, the more serious student of Hispanic American history can hardly fail to acknowledge a debt of gratitude; for Professor Chapman has not lost sight of him. Not only has he presented much new material and placed California history in its Hispanic and North American setting, but he has pointed out numerous topics for further investigation and included in the appendix what will prove an almost indispensable bibliographical guide.

Unless the book be criticised on the ground that it is too serious and detailed and heavy in places for the general reader—a thing which is doubtful and which, if true, could well be considered a reflection upon this gentle being and not the author—one can find little fault with it. There are, however, a few minor errors and defects. The first sentence of the preface is somewhat awkward; the opening sentences of the last paragraph of Chapter I. convey the impression that the author considers the Indians of California as belonging to the "great peoples" who either by land or by sea advanced towards the Californias; the author fails, in keeping with his intention (expressed in the preface) to mention "strikingly important items" bearing on each chapter at the end of the chapter in question, to refer to Pochstaller's thesis on the Jesuits in Baja California or to Bolton's *Father Kino* and *Spanish Borderlands* in connection with the account of the overland advance to the Californias, 1687–1765, as he likewise fails to mention in his bibliography Blair and Robertson's documents on the Philippines and such important and pertinent French works as those of Duhaut-Cilly and Duflot de Mofras.

Such minor defects as these may easily be remedied in a second edition, however; and all of them combined are insignificant when balanced against the important merits of the work. Professor Chapman has produced, in the opinion of the reviewer, the best all round single volume on California, and it will perhaps be a long time before it is superseded by one more trustworthy or even more interesting and attractive. It is hoped that Professor Clelland who, with a viewpoint "precisely analogous" to that of Chapman, is now writing an account of the American period of California history will achieve an equal measure of success.

University of Chicago.

J. FRED RIPPY.

Problems in Pan Americanism. By SAMUEL GUY INMAN. (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921. Pp. vii, 415. \$2.00.)

At a strategic moment in the external relations of the republics of the Americas comes an exceedingly well timed and pertinent volume. As the United States pauses at the parting of the ways, perhaps, with respect to its attitude toward, and relations with, the nations of Hispanic America, the way is indicated by a writer who is thoroughly competent to speak on such matters. The book does not belie its title, but the author's purpose, stated at the beginning and conspicuous throughout, is not merely to show the obstacles to the growth of Pan Americanism, but is more to lead the peoples of the two Americas to better understanding and accord through a knowledge of the problems to be overcome.

As a suitable foundation for the particular purpose in view, the first two chapters are devoted to the assets and the outstanding problems of Hispanic America. In the first of these, Hispanic American culture is justified and many false notions dissipated by tangible evidences of the many-sided culture of which the author speaks. The almost complete ignorance existing in the United States concerning the finer phases of life and culture in Hispanic America is treated rather as a culpable fault, when, however deplorable, it might be treated more properly until the beginning of the present century, at least, as the result of the historical circumstances under which this country has developed, having been absorbed during most of the nineteenth century in expanding to the limits of a large part of a relatively unoccupied continent, with small thought for anything external.

In the second chapter are depicted the evils in the Hispanic American institutions as seen by their own representatives. While the individuals quoted maintain varying attitudes toward the United States, they uniformly admit the vices of their countrymen, but only in general terms and optimistic vein. The Indian problem is presented here in a masterly way, with an appeal to the Americans of the north to assist in removing this "great stumbling block to the orderly and democratic development of the various American republics".

In the following pages, the beginning of Hispanic American suspicion and ill-will is traced to the Mexican War and to the boastful doctrine of "Manifest Destiny". Special stress is laid on the assertion that the original Monroe Doctrine, which was cordially accepted throughout Hispanic America in 1823 without fear or foreboding, has been extensively misinterpreted in the country of origin. The Monroe pronounce-

ment was welcomed at the outset as meaning that the American republics would jointly carry out the principles of the message, and Hispanic Americans became alienated only when it became apparent that the Doctrine was unilateral only. The author is a staunch supporter of the Doctrine in its original sense, and shows that typical citizens of Hispanic America are as well. The Doctrine of 1823 is shown to be distinct from the later policies of (1) the headship of the United States in America, (2) imperialism, and (3) Pan Americanism. The conclusion is that only with a return to the original Doctrine and a clear definition of our attitude toward the states of the south is Pan Americanism possible.

Each step in the history of Pan American efforts is accurately portrayed, showing the motives and agencies operative and opinions prevalent in both North and South America. The opportunities for permanent coöperation afforded by the World War, and the failure of the United States to take advantage of them, form an unenviable page in our national record.

The discussion of present conditions and problems in the Caribbean is especially lucid. The author is possessed of much recent information on conditions here, and his *exposé* of conditions accompanying the intervention of the United States in various small republics substantiates and supplements the information lately available through certain press agencies. The interests of the United States in the Caribbean are explained as equivalent to colonialism, and the author offers as a substitute for the present bungling method a constructive program which the United States might follow without sacrifice in any way of interests or prestige. As to intervention in Hayti and Santo Domingo, he says, "The system, not the personnel, is the thing which is not American". Here is presented a strong plea for United States sympathy, justice, and moral help in place of marines, dictates, and one-sided treaties.

On the whole, the book makes out a rather bad case for the United States, whose average citizen (and official) cares not a whit what is said of him in Hispanic America, which he assumes offhand to be inhabited by a race of unprincipled, irresponsible sentimentalists. The growth of feeling against the United States is clearly brought out, and the reader is made to believe that, despite certain counteracting tendencies, we are living in a critical moment when the respect and consideration of our southern neighbors can still be recovered, while, if definite and well directed effort is not soon exerted, this consideration may be irreparably lost. Pointing an essential step in the right direction, the author says:

"There can be no true American solidarity until the various people really know each other—understand each other's point of view, habits of thought, literature and life." He undoubtedly assumed the appreciation on the part of the reader that ignorance is usually the cause of that fatal sequence which continues with suspicion, fear, and hate, to armed conflict.

The author fortifies himself with the statement that his book is not a history. Neither is it propaganda in the usual sense of the word, for while it has an ulterior purpose, it contains only historical facts and quoted statements from leading Americans of both north and south, impartially presented. As a matter of fact, the book consists of quotations to a very considerable extent; at times the reader feels that the author might have curtailed his citation of sources and replaced them with his own critical comments to good advantage. Vast evidence is given of thorough acquaintanceship with the documentary materials pertaining to the development of our sister republics as well as with the correspondence and official statements of the heads of our own government during the past century.

The book is the work of a man imbued with the spirit of a great and worthy cause. It is comprehensive, readable, and in many places vivid. Short lists of sources for further information are appended to each chapter, and a selected bibliography of some seventy titles appears at the end. The book is well designed and constructed, and is strictly up-to-date. It certainly succeeds in one of its primary purposes—that of clearly presenting the forces which make for aloofness or for unity in inter-American relations—and should go far in aiding the accomplishment of the ultimate aim, Pan American solidarity.

Tufts College.

HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

Venezuela: a Commercial and Industrial Handbook. By P. L. BELL, Trade Commissioner. [Special Agents Series, No. 212, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce.] (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922. Pp. xvi, 472. Maps; illus.; index. Bound in buckram. \$1.00.)

This handbook maintains in every respect the high standard set by its three predecessors, namely, the handbooks on Bolivia and Paraguay by William Lytle Schurz, now Commercial Attaché in Brazil and that on Colombia, by Mr. Bell. The present book is easily the best general economic work that has ever been written on Venezuela in

English, and probably in any language. Its author knows Venezuela as well as, and probably better than, any other North American, and his work is, therefore, authoritative.

In this substantial volume are discussed the following matters: in the Introduction, general economic position of the country, the language, weights and measures, currency, postage, and telegraph, cable, and wireless service; geography, topography, and climate; population and living conditions; education; national finance; agriculture; tanning materials; mining; petroleum; live stock and cattle raising; fishing industry; manufacturing; Caracas and its commercial district; Maracaibo commercial district; Puerto Cabello and Valencia commercial district; Ciudad Bolívar commercial district; transportation; foreign trade; banks and banking; tariff system and regulations on import trade; commercial practice and requirements; markets for specific classes of merchandise; the Dutch West Indies; and trade lists relating to Venezuela. The material is well arranged and with the topical headings, it is easy to locate specific matters. The index is only mediocre, but it is a relief to find such an aid in a government publication. The several maps are well chosen and fulfill their purpose. In addition to the general map of the country, there are maps showing the petroleum deposits, the several commercial districts, and several of the Dutch West Indies.

Venezuela, by virtue of its numerous ports, which give access to wide stretches of country, Mr. Bell observes, is worthy of study by American interests, "not only for trade but as a new field for the development of natural resources, raw material, and engineering projects". Although European (chiefly German) influence has long been paramount in Venezuela, the influence of the United States is growing. Trade and industry have been given an impetus because of the war. If the business men of the United States would retain their trade with Venezuela and increase it, "the keynote should be an intensive cultivation of the personal relation with Venezuelan business men; better attention to the commercial possibilities and industrial enterprises that need only capital, ingenuity, and ability; and a close and detailed study of the potentialities of the country. Study of the merchandizing needs and requirements and attention to the details of exporting are absolutely essential. Americans who display an interest in Venezuela will be met more than halfway by Venezuelan business men." This is sound advice, not only for the business man but for the professional man who visits this interesting country, and especially for the teacher.

The section on population and living conditions is especially good and

should be read carefully by all travelers to Venezuela. The portions treating of the several industries and of trade are comprehensive and filled with concise information not obtainable elsewhere. The several commercial districts are treated intimately and at length. The Dutch West Indies are here treated because of their proximity to Venezuela and because they lie in the same general trade district with that country. The entire work is the result of personal investigation in Venezuela.

Because of its excellence, this should be a desk book for all exporters, manufacturers, and investors of the United States who are interested in South America. It should also be on the shelves of all teachers of Hispanic American history, because of its basic background material. By all means, should it become a text book in all educational institutions which give courses in foreign trade. A rare service has been performed by the government in its publication.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Glimpses of South America. By F. A. SHERWOOD. (New York: The Century Co., 1920. Pp. ix, 406. Illus.; index. \$4.00.)

This volume is well named. It is the result of random notes made by its author during two visits to South America. On these two visits he says that he simply followed the beaten track, going into no out-of-the-way places nor enjoying any special privileges. While his visits have been longer than those of the usual traveler, they have not, he says modestly, been long enough for him to interpret the real significance of the contemporaneous life that is going on from year to year in South America. Because his notes, which were jotted down originally merely for the personal amusement of the author, cover exactly the ground that would be covered by the ordinary traveler from the United States, they have been polished up and made into the present volume.

The book, so the author states in his preface (from which the foregoing has been taken), is an unconventional and informal one. However, it is an extremely interesting volume, partly because of this fact, and partly because Mr. Sherwood has had the faculty of careful observation. He has a happy sense of humor which he has not taken pains to exclude from his notes as published. A glance at his table of contents gives no indication of the contents and style of treatment, and the reader, unless warned by the preface (which some through habit will probably skip, thereby depriving themselves in this instance of a pleasure) will come upon a field of nuggets from the outset.

The notes take us to Kingston and Panama, Peru and Chile, over the

Andes to Buenos Aires, to Montevideo, to Rio de Janeiro, and home again. The description of the journey over the Andes is of especial interest and is well related. The notes on Argentina and its capital take up considerably more space than any other region. The reader should not miss the description of the inland Argentine city of Mendoza. The artistic appearance of the city of Buenos Aires impressed Mr. Sherwood continually, and he refers again and again to this. Its cosmopolitanism also comes in for mention. Throughout many a quaint incident is related and much useful information imparted.

In his note on the Spanish spoken in Argentina (pp. 295-296), the author falls into a slight inaccuracy in ascribing the "j" sound given to the liquid "ll" and to the "y" to Argentine usage. These sound are heard constantly in Andalusia and in other parts of Old Spain, and are, moreover, in common use among the Spanish gypsies. They are, therefore, an importation from the mother country, but may, of course have become accentuated in Argentina. One must always distinguish between the Castilian Spanish and that of other parts of Spain.

This is not a guidebook—a fact distinctly stated by the author—but it is a book to take along with the guidebook, and when serious and humorless companions and regular guidebooks pall, to open and enjoy—and, withal, enjoy with advantage. The historian will find no history of special note in it, and the economist will find no carefully digested economic facts. But they, as well as common travelers who go to enjoy and, perchance, to gain new laurels in business, will find it a pleasant companion.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

The Gulf of Misunderstanding, or North and South America as seen by each other. By TANCREDO PINOCHET. (New York: Boni & Liveright, 1920. Pp. vii, 275, \$2.50.)

The author of this book is the Spanish editor of the monthly paper called *The South American*, which is published in New York. The volume was written in Spanish and translated into English, appearing first in monthly installments in the paper above mentioned. The translation we are told in a special announcement, was made by Cecilia M. Brennan and William Sachs, while Charles Evers, editor of *The South American*, "guided by the Spanish version, revised and polished the English text". The result has been a very readable and interesting text.

This is not a story. It is rather a series of essays on the viewpoint

of people in North and South America. The introduction is so interesting and so well shows the reason for the book, that we can with impunity quote a considerable part of it. In this book says the author, a man and a woman speak.

The woman—so says the book—was born and educated in Chicago, but she might just as well have been born and educated in Buffalo, New York or Seattle. She is a woman of the country. The man—so says the book—was born in Santiago, Chile, but he might as well have been born in Argentina, Colombia or Ecuador. He is a man of Latin America.

The man—so says the book—wrote letters to his wife about this country. It is of no particular importance that these letters were addressed to his wife; they might as well have been sent to his son, to his brother, or to one of his friends. Or he might have talked to them on the subject instead of writing, or else he might have only thought about these matters instead of writing or speaking about them. Any man who has left the environment in which he has always lived sees things other than those which he has seen before, and is guided by a new train of thought. . . .

The woman—so says the book—is a member of the Censor's Department of the United States Government during the war. It would make no difference if she were not. She is only a symbol, because every woman is a member of the body of censors in war-time and in time of peace, when the beliefs and moral code of her country are attacked.

The woman repudiates the way of writing—or speaking, or thinking—of the representative of another race which is in contact with hers, and she makes her protest, in writing alongside what the man has written.

So much for the setting of the book. The censor happens in the course of her duties to read all the letters written to his wife by the Chilean who censures the life and institutions of the United States with an unsparing hand. Struck by the first of these letters, she wrote also to the wife giving the viewpoint of the United States. The letters with their comments embrace the subjects of idealism, democracy, imperialism, black and white, woman's suffrage, marriage and divorce, religion, prohibition, education, character and habits, and Pan Americanism. One may not agree with all that has been written in these letters, either pro or con, but he will recognize the book as a thoughtful production. The book is ingeniously written and its attempt to remove prejudice between North and South Americans can but be applauded. Modern business men, travelers for pleasure, and students who go from the north to the south or come from the south to the north for purposes of study are swiftly removing these prejudices. Direct contact is making for a real Pan Americanism.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

NOTES AND COMMENT

ADDRESS OF DON ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTÍN, PROFESSOR IN THE CENTRAL UNIVERSITY OF MADRID, IN THE EXERCISES COMMEMORATING THE SEVENTH CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALFONSO X., THE WISE, IN NOVEMBER, 1921

Translated from the Spanish by CONSTANTINE E. MCGUIRE, of Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

In the name of the Royal Academies of Moral and Political Sciences and of Jurisprudence and Legislation, I have the honor to join in the expression of respect which is this day paid to that great monarch of the thirteenth century, to whom civilization and culture owe so much, and who was without equal from Charlemagne to the Medici in the subjects which are the concern of these academies, as was acutely remarked by the Count of Puymaigre.

As a man, he was congenial and attractive, and yet as a governor and statesman singularly unsuccessful. He did not know how to curb the excesses of the nobility, whose lack of discipline—so characteristic of Spaniards—continued to increase in violence until it attained the shocking proportions with which the disastrous epoch of Henry IV. is associated. Thus, sometimes it was Don Diego López de Haro and his son Don Lope Díaz, and again his own brother, Don Enrique, or Don Nuño de Lara, with his many barons and gentlemen, and finally, even his own son Sancho, who embittered his days with rebellion and conspiracy. He caused his people grave embarrassment by his regulations on money and weights and measures. He frittered away his time miserably, because of his constant concern regarding "the business of the Empire" of Germany, the one thing in regard to which he was able to accomplish when he returned from Belcaire to Castile was, as the chronicle sets forth, the conviction that "in the business of the Empire they were mocking him and he had expended in this journey much substance". But we must bear in mind, if we are to judge him fairly, that there is no first cause in the chain of events in this old world of

ours and that, in fact, the most serious events of the most disastrous period in history find their precedent, if not their justification, in the preceding social and political states. If it was true that Don Sancho rose in rebellion against his father, it was also true that the father of the Wise King, Saint Ferdinand, was also actually at war with his father, Alfonso IX. of León. If the gentry were fond of disturbances in the time of Alfonso X., they were no less so in the days of Ferdinand III. who was obliged to struggle with Rodrigo Díaz, among others, and Gonzalo de Lara. If the king aspired to become Emperor of Germany it was because his mother was Doña Beatriz, daughter of the Duke of Suabia, the Emperor. One man may be the father of another and he may bring his own life to an end at a given moment, but neither the birth nor death of nations depends upon the individual will no matter how powerful it may be, nor may the will of one suffice by itself to determine the prosperity or decline of a people.

As was said by the Prophet, if the pastors scatter and drive away the flocks from their fold, the Lord is able to gather them together, and make them return to their own fields, where they will increase and be multiplied.¹

If there is anything truly distinctive of the period of Alfonso the Wise, it is, in my opinion, the fact that it represents, better than any other epoch in medieval Spanish history, the Oriental Renaissance, which did not again take place in anywhere near the same degree until the nineteenth century. This Renaissance is obvious in all the work of the Wise King. In his scientific work it is to be found, inasmuch as it is known that his *Lapidarios* and the *Libros del Saber de Astronomía* are based on Arabic and Hebrew authors. So far as his literary work is concerned, his book *Calila y Dimna* is of Oriental origin, and so too are the *Bonium* or *Bocados de oro*, the *Poridat de las Poridades*, *De los Juegos de Ajedrez*, and *Dados e Tablas*. In his historical work, the use of Arabic sources is common in the *Estoria de Espanna* and the *Grande et General Estoria*. As Ríos has called to our attention, the legislative work of the King indicates Oriental influence in that a large part of the sentences and reflections on political principles which are to be found in the second *Partida* are taken literally from the Arabic book *Poridat de las Poridades*, which was also known under the title *Enseñamientos y Castigos de Alixandre*.

This legislative work is perhaps the part of chief interest today of the work of Alfonso the Wise. All the rest will be a source of pleasure

¹ See Jeremiah, XXIII, 1-4.

to the scholar and information to the historian, but the *Siete Partidas* in part, at least, may be regarded as even yet in effect.

The *Septenario* (unfinished), the *Espéculo* (concerning the purpose of which there is still much to be said), the *Fuero Real*, a kind of general code for Castile, finished in 1255, the *Partidas*, begun June 23, 1256, and finished in 1263 or 1265, the *Ordenamiento de las Tafurerías*, drawn up by master Roldán in 1276, the *Leyes de los Adelantados mayores*, and the *Leyes Nuevas* (promulgated after the *Fuero Real*) constitute the principal part of the legislative work of Alfonso the Wise. The thing that stands out in it all, not so much because of its national character which is far more evident in the *Fuero Real*, but because of its extent and doctrinal importance, is the code known as the *Siete Partidas*. This code did not become legally effective until 1348. In its preparation, as the distinguished Martínez Marina suggested, there probably took part master Jacomo de Junta, known also as James of the Law, who was perhaps educated in Italy, and concerning whom Señor Ureña and I have some interesting data which we shall shortly publish. Likewise, it is probable that the Wise King himself took part in the preparation (see, for instance, the prologue, the introduction of title I of *Partida I*, and law 3 of the same title I, among other instances). Alfonso X. had the plan (which was that of Saint Ferdinand, according to his son's remark in the prologue of the *Partidas*) of preparing a book in which "the kings of our realm may view themselves as in a mirror and see things which they must correct, and correct them according to the manner in which they should act towards their people". With this in mind he says, "we select the words and the good sayings of the wise men who understood things in a reasonable manner according to their nature, and we have taken, too, the principles of the laws and of the good legislation which was enacted by the great rulers and the other men who knew law well, in the lands over which they exercised jurisdiction".

Grave difficulty is presented, beyond any doubt, by legislation which lacks uniformity and consequently the plan of unification which the Wise King sought to carry out was praiseworthy and noble. But the law is a natural phenomenon, a living thing, and its organism is not to be changed in structure according to the caprice of the legislator. The work of the *Fuero Real*, the preparation for which lay in the generalization of the admirable *Fuero de Cuenca*, was undoubtedly beneficial for the law of Castile. The nucleus of future nationality—which without Castile would not have existed—was being elaborated in

Castile, and it was a king of Castile who sought to unify juridical standards in accordance with scientific criticism and under the impulse of that truly national passion which inspired the fine chapter of the *Loores de Espanna*, which is written into the *Crónica general*. But in the *Partidas* it is not precisely Hispanic law which predominates, it is not the living law, but the law learned in the schools of Bologna by poring over the manuscripts of the Pandects and of the Decretals. To be sure, there are not lacking references to the "laws and rulings which they made of old in Spain" (see, for example, law 5, title XV of *Partida II*); but more abundant still are the deferential references to "the ancient laws and statutes which were made by the wise men and philosophers on the order and with the sanction of the emperors" (law 1, title XVII, *Partida IV*). Frequent, too, is that formula "In Latin it is said", which clearly indicates the constant reference to the classical text. If it be true that in Cataluña the direct superimposing of the law of Justinian paralyzed in part the development of the juridical life of the region, what happened in Castile was much the same, but it took place in a long drawn-out process of well-intended adaptation. Thus in the fifteenth century the Castilian monarchs could sign a letter with a phrase such as to be found in the letter of King Martin (published by Señor Rubió y Lluch in volume I. of his *Documents per l'història de la cultura catalana mig-èval*) which bears the date of August 9, 1406, at Valencia, and is directed to the rectors of Bologna, recommending to them the young man Juan de Cruylles about to proceed to carry on studies in that city, "*tanquam ad fontem Castaliam ac Heliconum montem*".

In any event, as a work of legal doctrine the *Partidas* are a genuine monument. It was well said by Martínez Marina (who up to this time is the man best acquainted with them) that "the political societies of Europe in the Middle Ages can present no work of jurisprudence or of any other sort comparable with that which was completed in Castile under the patronage of the Wise King".

And it is and will always be a glorious thing for our native land that we had not only so admirable a book in which shape was given to the essential reasons of juridical principles in the introductory clause of each precept, but also that court of the strange aspect which seems to continue the philosophic syncretism of the school of Archbishop Raymond of Toledo (whose work constitutes the renovation of the scientific and philosophic culture of the Middle Ages) and in which Arabs and Jews work side by side with Christian clergy, while the king delights

to listen to accounts of India and Persia, devotes himself to the composition of poetry in the Portuguese-Gallego tongue, becomes immersed in theosophic mysteries (from which, indeed, he derives the structure of the legal codifications), wonders at the marvels of alchemy, feels obliged to calculate according to the era of the Arabs, as well as according to that of the Incarnation, and manifests his romantic affection for the deeds of the Launcelots and Tristrams even to the point of dating documents "in the year when Edward, heir of King Henry of England, received knighthood from the said King Alfonso".

THE BEGINNINGS OF HAVANA¹

Columbus discovered Cuba in 1492, and explored some little part of its northern coast. In 1494, he explored the south coast, arriving further west than the Isle of Pines. Castaways from ships wrecked on Cuba en route between Central and South America, and Santo Domingo, straggled through the island in years immediately following, and their reports and those of Spaniards who pursued runaway Haitians into Cuba, must have given rise to the hope that gold would be found there in greater quantities than it was being found in Haiti. Therefore, either very late in 1510 or early in 1511, Diego Velazquez set out from La Española at the head of an expedition, the ostensible purpose of which was to explore Cuba with a view to finding mines.

In 1513 a prospecting party under Panfilo de Narvaez, accompanied by Fray Bartolome de las Casas, carried the Spanish conquest of the island as far west as the region which is now Havana province, in arriving there prior to Christmas time. This party turned back to Xagua for the holidays, which were spent with Velazquez on islets of Cienfuegos Bay. Shortly afterwards Narvaez and some sixty men returned west, by land, and the inference is that then they established

¹ In 1918, the Academy of History at Havana widely advertised an open competition for a documented history of Havana. At that time inquiries concerning documents bearing on the matter of the founding of Havana were addressed to the Archivo General de Indias; but the writer understands that they elicited little information. Prior to November, 1920, the jury selected to judge manuscripts in this competition, it has been reported, awarded the prize to one submitted under the *lema* *Quien no ha visto Sevilla* . . . but no announcement to that effect has been made. This work, which carries seven heretofore unpublished plans, and 180 documents by way of appendix, remains inaccessible in the possession of the Havana Academy of History.

on the south coast of Cuba the settlement which developed into the capital city of San Cristobal de la Habana.

The authority for these statements is Las Casas, in his *Historia General de las Indias*. His narrative of the events of the conquest of Cuba is well borne out by documents existing in the Archivo General de Indias. It remains, however, the main source, to which they contribute some few details, and confirmation. The author has hoped, in vain, to discover at Seville some fuller account of Narvaez's expedition; none has been found, nor any documents directly bearing upon the founding of Havana.

It may be deduced, though perhaps not safely asserted, that Havana was founded on July 25, 1514. It may be deduced, inasmuch as on August 1, 1515, the governor and royal officials writing² from Santiago de Cuba state that at the time of said writing there were seven churches in Cuba. One certainly was at Baracoa, and another as certainly at Bayamo. It is logical to suppose that the others were at Trinidad, at Sancti Spiritus, at Puerto del Principe and at Havana, respectively, and the seventh in the seventh and last settlement established, which was Santiago de Cuba. If this line of reasoning is correct, Havana must have been founded, along with its church, between January of 1513 (when Narvaez returned to the west) and August of 1515 (when the governor and royal officials at Santiago de Cuba announced that seven churches existed).

Given the name it bears, it is also logical to surmise that the city was founded upon Saint Christopher's day, which is July 25th, and necessarily, then, in the year 1514; for had it been as late as 1515 the governor and officials, in those days of slow communication, as far away as Santiago de Cuba could not possibly have been informed of that event by August 1, following.

Havana was established first on the south coast of the island because the southern continent had begun to yield gold and the crown was most interested in encouraging exploration and conquest there, especially, at the moment, of Castilla del Oro. It was desired that Cuba become a base of operation and supply. Vessels returning from the isthmus wrecked frequently on the south coast of the island; settlements on that shore—at Santiago, around the mouth of the Cauto river, at Trinidad, and where Havana was first established (in the general vicinity of Batabano)—were approved, in that they served to protect shipping in affording harbors of refuge to vessels and men.³

² A. de I., 2-1-2/26, 2.

³ A. de I., 139-1-5, Vol. IV., p. 208 r.; Vol. V., pp. 69, 91, 117, 119, 203.

In itself, the site so chosen for Havana was undesirable—low and hot—and possibly the settlers had begun to abandon it in favor of the infinitely better location, which the city now occupies, on the north coast, even before the discovery and conquest of Mexico turned westward, instead of south, the current of royal interest, of exploration, of emigration, and, consequently, of what traffic there was.

Fray Bartolome de las Casas states that what is now Havana harbor was first called Carenas bay. The port was known to seamen of the time—to Sebastian de Ocampo, who is by some supposed to have discovered and named it, to Francisco Fernandez de Cordoba, to Juan de Grijalva, and doubtless to many another captain of the sort.⁴

Velazquez, as governor, assigned *vecindades*, and, as *repartidor* of the natives of Cuba, allotted *encomiendas*, in the west. Among persons whose holdings of land and natives lay in the immediate vicinity of the present site of Havana, was Velazquez's cousin, Juan de Rojas.⁵ At Havana, probably because of the great distance between that settlement and his own seat, now at Santiago, Velazquez named a *teniente a guerra*⁶ to represent him. It is possible that in 1519 this lieutenant was Juan de Rojas.⁷ And, since Juan de Rojas was more interested on the north coast than he was on the south, it is possible that this, his personal interest, was a large factor in Havana's removal from the south shore to the north.

In 1518 Grijalva found settlers on the north shore with supplies to sell to his ships; but Cortes, putting into the south coast port either very late in that same year or early in 1519, did not find the original site of Havana entirely deserted, since there, too, there were persons on hand⁸ to sell supplies to him. However, the removal from the

⁴ Prowling slavers they were, "scandalizing" Juan Ponce's "Bimini and the island of Florida" (*A. de I.*, 139-1-5, Vol. VI., p. 250 r.); slavers who presently became discoverers, explorers, and conquerors of those richer domains farther west, of which they heard first from their captives.

⁵ *A. de I.*, 2-2-1/14. Rojas had an *encomienda* at Caynimar which was dwindling in 1519. Among other very early settlers here was Juan de Alia, interested in business with Velazquez (*A. de I.*, 47-2-8/3), and Pedro de Velazquez de Leon, *vecino* of Havana in 1518; whose seat was Matanzas (*A. de I.*, 47-2-8/3; 1-3-30/2). In 1526, Pedro de Villaroel claimed (*A. de I.*, 1-2-1/21) to have been an original settler in the town.

⁶ *A. de I.*, 139-1-7, Vol. 13, p. 432 r.

⁷ *A. de I.*, 2-2-1/14. This document, dated September 11, 1519, shows that Rojas was then Velazquez's agent, but it does not give him any title.

⁸ *A. de I.*, 1-1-1/15, 16. This document mentions Juan Nuñez Sedeño, *vecino de la Habana*, as selling supplies to Cortes at the south coast port. The writer should say that his name must lead any list of first settlers in Havana, compiled from evidence available in the Archivo de Indias.

south to the north coast, must have been made at this time (1518-1519). The writer has not seen at Seville any document upon which to base a more definite assertion.

There is a tradition that when this removal was made, Havana settled first at the mouth of the Almendares river (*i.e.*, at La Chorrera) or perhaps at San Lazaro inlet. The writer has seen two documents⁹ which would seem to uphold this tradition; but, unhappily, the writer has not seen any official record, nor any communication whatsoever, setting forth finally the facts concerning either the founding of Havana on the south, or its removal to the north coast of Cuba.

Neither has the writer seen any documents to warrant any attempt to determine the boundaries of the original municipality of Havana. It extended farther east than Matanzas, and covered the west, to the Cabo de San Anton.

The first *alcaldes* and *regidores*¹⁰ were probably appointed by Velazquez or his representative. Presumably they were a first and second *alcalde*, and three *regidores*, to constitute the *cabildo* over which the *teniente a guerra* presided, as the governor presided over Santiago's council, without (it developed later) any right to do so. Doubtless there was an *alguacil*; certainly there were *escribanos*.¹¹ The *cabildo* elected the *procurador*, even after the crown had, in 1528, ordered that he be chosen by popular suffrage yearly.¹² After 1518, the crown appointed *regidores perpetuos*, and the municipal councils of the island, which now elected the *alcaldes*, became the strongholds of a small oligarchy whose members ruled the colony.

Havana was humble in those days. It was, in fact, during its first two decades of life, nothing but a cluster of *bohios* along the bay shore,

⁹ *A. de I.*, 47-1-19.

¹⁰ *A. de I.*, 139-1-6, Vol. IX., p. 163. This document mentions that Diego de Castañeda was *alcalde* of Havana when Juan Ponce died there. Juan de Obas was *tenedor de difuntos* then (*ibid.*). In 1532, Domingo de Quexo and Francisco de Madrid were *alcaldes*; Juan de Rojas and Juan de Bazan were *regidores* (*A. de I.*, 54-1-32). In 1533, Juan Bono de Quexo was governor's lieutenant in Havana (*A. de I.*, 79-4-1, Vol. I, p. 134) and had been accused of shipping gold to Spain in a manner to defraud the crown. The Quexos (Domingo was Juan's son) would appear to have been among the *conquistadores* of the region around Havana; they were powerful, prosperous, and conservative (*A. de I.* 139-1-8, Vol. XVI., p. 89; 79-4-1, Vol. II., pp. 9, 121 r.).

¹¹ *A. de I.*, 139-1-5, Vol. VII., p. 171 r.; 139-1-16, Vol. IX., p. 216 r. This latter document shows that Diego de Caçadilla was made *escribano del numero y consejo de la Habana* under date of October 12, 1523.

¹² *A. de I.*, 54-1-32.

from what is now the State Department building to the Lonja. Its center, then and now, was the *plaza de armas*, on which faced the unpretentious residences of its principal citizens. These were intelligent, industrious men. Their activity extended far, for they were masters of the island, from almost the middle of it to its westernmost extremity. They owned, or thought they owned,¹³ great cattle ranges over which their half-savage cowmen hunted their wholly wild stock, to kill and cure meat and hides for exportation. They owned, or thought they owned, farms whereon their red *encomendados*, diminishing in numbers, and their black slaves, prolifically augmenting, grew what crops were in demand, then, for the supply of passing vessels which in increasing numbers frequented Havana bay.

The future of the city they had founded lay in the excellence of its harbor and in the geographical situation, with respect to North, Central and South America, of the site which they had chosen—a choice fully confirmed by the discovery of the Bahama channel route to Europe.

French corsairs early reminded his most Catholic majesty of Spain that Havana was the key to the New World. In 1538 the king determined to fortify the place;¹⁴ but Havana's history as the capital of Cuba did not begin until Governor Perez de Angulo established his residence there in the year 1550.

The foregoing brief consideration of the facts, concerning the establishment of Havana, which the author has found set forth in documents available in the Archivo de Indias, brings out the following points in sharp distinction to the traditions which Havana and its chroniclers have heretofore accepted as history:

1. The founder.—Las Casas states that Velazquez founded seven cities in Cuba, Havana being one of them. The detail that Velazquez himself was not present at the founding of Havana is no contradiction of this statement, for, although Panfilo de Narvaez founded Havana, he did so upon Velazquez's authority, and that authority, be it observed, was his authority as governor's lieutenant under Colon and *repartidor* under the king, and not as *adelantado*, for not until November 13, 1518, was Velazquez made *adelantado*, and then, not of Cuba. In Cuba to the end he remained governor's lieutenant under Colon and royal *repartidor* of the natives.

2. The date.—1514, not 1515, Havana being the sixth (probably), certainly not the seventh city founded in Cuba. The writer has cited

¹³ As a matter of fact it developed later that they held titles in usufruct only.

¹⁴ A. de I., 79-4-1, Vol. II., p. 111 r.; 54-1-32.

documentary proof that Santiago, the seventh city, was founded fairly early in 1515; which document, considered in juxtaposition to the fact that it was after Christmas of 1513 that Narvaez returned from Cienfuegos into the west, to establish Havana, makes it almost safe to conclude that Havana was founded in 1514—a year earlier than the usually accepted date.

3. The place.—There can be no question that Havana was first situated upon the south coast. The date and the circumstances of its removal to the north coast are none too clear. The author would suggest, however, that its probable first site on that side the island, was not La Chorrera, but San Lazaro inlet, for a very long time thereafter an anchorage of some importance. While this matter, also, is far from clear the writer is prepared to defend this suggestion as against the general acceptance of La Chorrera as the primitive site of Havana on the north shore.

I. A. WRIGHT.

NOTES ON THE BRAZIL CENTENARY EXPOSITION

The May issue of the *Ilustração Brasileira*, the official publicity organ of the Brazilian Centennial Commission, under the heading "Comissão Executiva do Centenario da Independencia Expediente", publishes items as follows: "Participação dos Estados Unidos Mexicanos"; "O Pavilhao industrial Norte-Americano"; "Serviços da representação estrangeira"; "Estações Radiotelegraphicas"; "Conferencia sobre o Brasil em Buenos Aires"; "Congresso Internacional de Historia da America" (with subsections—Historica; A comissão executiva do congresso; Organização dos trabalhos; Adhesoes; Trabalhos recibidos); "20º Congresso Internacional de Americanistas"; "Congresso Internacional de Engenharia"; "2º Congresso da Creança"; "Medalha commemorativa", "Secção musical", "Juramento juvenil a' bandeira"; "O centenario e as escolas primarias subvencionadas pel União", "Desfile escolar"; "Jogos athleticos e desportivos"; "Edificios historicos de Ouro Preto"; "Cortejo Allegorico luminoso"; and "Diversas notas".

The building of the United States will be the largest erected within the exposition grounds. The plans were drawn by J. Wesley Fitch, president of The United States Exhibits, Inc., and have been approved by Col. David C. Collier, the head of the American Commission. In addition to the space reserved for the exhibitors, spaces have been

set aside for a large restaurant, a soda-water fountain, a bandstand, and a large reception hall. It is stated that the building will be opened by September 7.

The Instituto Historico e Geographico Brasileiro began to plan for the celebration of Brazil's independence as early as 1898, and the International Congress of the History of America has definitely been a part of the program since 1914. Invitations were sent to all countries, with which Brazil had had contact, to participate in that Congress. An executive committee was appointed by the Conde de Affonso Celso, permanent president of the Instituto, consisting of the following gentlemen: Benjamin Franklin Ramiz Galvão, Epitacio da Silva Pessoa, José Vieira Fazenda, Max Fleiuss, Almirante Arthur Indio do Brasil, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, Sebastião de Vasconcellos Galvão, Pedro Lessa, Martim Francisco Ribeiro de Andrada, José Leopoldo de Bulhões Jardim, Manoel Cicero Peregrino da Silva, João Pandiá Calogeras, Augusto Olympio Viveiros de Castro, Gastão Ruch Sturzenecker, Augusto Tavares de Lyra, Norival Soares de Freitas, José Felix Alves Pacheco, Almirante Antonio Coutinho Gomes Pereira, Eurico de Góes, Homero Baptista, Luiz Gastão d'Escragnolle Doria, Alberto Rangel, Alfredo Valladão, Edgard Roquette Pinto, Barão de Studart, Antonio Ferreira de Souza Pitanga, Affonso Arinos de Mello Franco, Theodoro Sampaio, Manoel de Mello Cardoso Barata, Clovis Bevilaqua, José Carlos Rodrigues, Marechal Thaumaturgo de Azevedo, Pedro Souto Maior, Ramon J. Cárcano, Commandante Radler de Aquino, Affonso d'Escragnolle Taunay, Julio Fernandes, Enéas Galvão, John Casper Branner, Lucas Ayarragaray, Coronel Liberato Bittencourt, and Commandante Raul Tavares.

At the first meeting of the Committee held on February 23, 1915, the following additional members were chosen: Conde de Affonso Celso, Rodrigo Octavio Langgaard de Menezes, Manoel Alvaro de Souza Sá Vianna, Gentil de Assis Moura, Affonso Augusto de Freitas, Henrique Augusto de Santa Rosa, Nelson de Senna, Diogo de Vasconcellos, Alfredo Rocha, João Luiz Alves, José Bonifacio, Jonathas Serrano, José Eduardo Freire de Carvalho, Lucio José dos Santos, Antonio Fernandes Figueira, Annibal Velloso Rebello, José Luiz Baptista, Alfredo Russell, Affonso Claudio, Aurelino Leal, Levy Carneiro, João Martins de Carvalho Mourão, Esmeraldino Bandeira, Agenor de Roure, General Moreira Guimarães, Fernando Magalhães, Luciano Pereira da Silva, Alfredo Pinto Vieira de Mello, Virgilio de Sá Pereira, Antonio de Barros Ramalho Ortigão, Astolpho Rezende, Francisco Tito de Souza Reis,

Silvio Rangel, Marechal Torres Homem, Commandante Lucas Boiteux, General Carlos de Campos, Marechal José Bernardino Bormann, General Antonio Dias de Oliveira, Arthur Pinto da Rocha, Augenio Vilhena de Moraes, Mucio da Paixão, Mauricio de Medeiros, A. G. Pereira da Silva, Gama Rosa, Silvio de Almeida, Miguel Arrojado Lisboa, and Bertino de Miranda.

At the meeting of June 25, 1921, the offices of sub-secretaries general were created, to which were appointed Sr. Agenor de Roure, First Lieutenant Carlos da Silveira Carneiro, and by substitution for Sr. Lucas Ayarragaray who had left Brazil, the ambassador from the United States, Dr. Edwin V. Morgan. Dr. Ricardo Levene, of the University of La Plata, was designated a special delegate of the congress in Argentina. As early as 1916, the participation in the congress by historical scholars of the United States was promised; while other American countries accepted the invitation.

Papers have already been presented to the Committee as follows: *Politica de Pombal em relação ao Brasil*, 6th of the 1st sub-section, by Dr. João Lucio de Azevedo. "*Historia das Artes plasticas no Brasil*", 22d of the 9th sub-section, by Dr. Argeu Guimarães. "*Regencia trina e una. Perfil de Feijó*", 11th of the 1st sub-section, by Dr. Eugenio Egas. "*Formação dos limites do Brasil*", 3d of the 8th sub-section, by Almirante José Candido Guillobel. "*Determinação da área conhecida do Brasil do Norte, até fins do seculo XVII. Principaes elementos que contribuíram para a sua exploração*", 3d of the 2d sub-section, by Padre J. B. Hafkemeyer, S. J. "*A Carta Constitucional de 1824. Idéas nella dominantes*", 5th of the 4th sub-section, by Dr. Cesar do Rego Monteiro. "*A marinha de guerra do Paraguay*", 6th of the 7th sub-section, by Commandante Raul Tavares. "*Os naturalistas viajantes dos seculos XVIII e XIX e o progresso da Ethnographia indigena no Brasil. Jazidas paleontologicas*", 5th of the 3d sub-section, by Padre Carlos Teschauer, S. J. "*Prodromos da Independencia e papel do Exercito e da Armada na formação autonoma do Brasil*", 2d of the 7th sub-section, by General Jos' Maria Moreira Guimarães. "*Da influencia estrangeira em nossas letras*", 14th of the 9th sub-section, by Dr. Adrien Delpech. "*Os primordios economicos no primeiro seculo do descobrimento. Como produziram e exerceram as industrias e o commercio os primitivos habitantes. Permuta de productos*", 1st of the 6th sub-section, by Dr. Rôso Lagôa. "*A Constituinte. A Constituição votada. Influência preponderante que sobre ella exerceu a Constituição Americana e alterações que ella introduziu neste molde.*"

Influencia que por sua vez exerceu a Constituição Argentina", 12th of the 4th sub-section, by Dr. Lopes Gonçalves. "A administração na Regencia", 19th of the 4th sub-section, by Dr. Theodoro de Magalhães. "Das associações literarias no periodo colonial", 4th of the 9th sub-section, by Sr. Max Fleiuss. "Formação do Exercito Brasileiro e sua evolução no seculo XIX", 11th of the 7th sub-section, by Capitão Nilo Val. "O descobrimento do Brasil. Hespanhóes e Portuguezes", 1st of the 1st sub-section, by Dr. Solidonio Leite. "Barroso, Tamandaré e Inhauma", 7th of the 7th sub-section, by Commandante Didio Costa. "Historia do rio Paraguay", 9th of the 2d sub-section (memoria incompleta, by Marechal Thaumaturgo de Azevedo). "Historia do rio Amazonas", 11th of the 2d sub-section, by Dr. Henrique Augusto de Santa Rosa. "Chronologia de la prensa del Equador", by Dr. Carlos A. Rolando. "Monographia da Guyana Franceza", by the governor thereof. "Historia del General Guines y Revolución de la Independencia", by D. Bernardo Frias.

Papers already received for the Twentieth International Congress of Americanists are as follows (see Program below): "Razas desaparecidas—Los Taironas", by Dr. Carlos Cuervo Marquez (Colombia). "Los Quillacs o Quillacingas", by Dr. Carlos Cuervo Marquez (Colombia). "La perception de los colores en algunas tribus indigenas de Colombia", by Dr. Carlos Cuervo Marquez (Colombia). "Las antiguas civilizaciones y razas del Perú", by Dr. Horacio H. Urteaga (Perú). "La Arqueologia americana en la civilizacion moderna", by Dr. Pedro Pablo Travensari (Perú). "O homem sul-americano perante a linguistica", by Dr. M. Moreira e Silva (Alagôas, Brasil). "Las excavaciones del pedregal de San Angel y la cultura archaica del valle del Mexico", by Dr. Manuel Gamio (Mexico). "El Alfabeto Mexicano y su valor fonético", by Dr. Manuel Gamio (Mexico). "Transcendencia política de la Anthropologia en América", by Dr. Manuel Gamio (Mexico). "Influencia de la lengua Guarany em Sud-América y Antillas", by Dr. Moisés Bertoni (Paraguay). "La lengua Guarany como documento histórico", by Dr. Moisés Bertoni (Paraguay). "Cultural Resemblances Between the Arctic Peoples", by Dr. William Thalbitzer (Denmark). "Os chamados Indios Canoeiros nunca existiram em Goyaz e nem existem no Brasil", by Major Henrique Silva (Rio de Janeiro). "El indio Guayki", by Dr. Guillermo Tell Bertoni (Paraguay). "La Yerba Mate", by Dr. Guillermo Tell Bertoni (Paraguay). "The Norsemen's Route from Greenland to Wineland", by Prof. Hanz Pedes Steensby (Denmark). "Notes on West Indian

Hydrography in its Relation to Prehistoric", by Sr. Adolfo de Hostos (Porto Rico). "O infinitamente grande como agente curador", by Dr. Honorio Rivereto (Rio de Janeiro). "Jean Cousin e Juan de la Cosa", by Dr. Carlos Leite (Rio de Janeiro). "A igualdade das raças, sob o ponto de vista psychico", by Dr. Honorio Rivereto (Rio de Janeiro). "Brasilidade idiomática" (Nomenclatura Indígena do Brasil), by Prof. Nelson de Senna (Rio de Janeiro). "Ocara Poty" (Flores Silvestres), by Dr. Narciso R. Comán (Paraguay). "A Tribu Crenac" (Índios Botocudos), by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva (Rio de Janeiro).

The following works were offered to the library of the Organizing committee of this congress for distribution to the members of the congress: "Influencia de la Lengua Guarany en Sud-America y Antillas", by Dr. Moisés Bertoni (20 copies). "Brief History of the International Congress of Americanists", by Alice C. Fletcher (20 copies). "Pontos de contacto das civilizações prehistoricas do Brasil e da Argentina com os paizes da costa do Pacifico", by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva (20 copies). "Viagens pelo Interior da Republica Argentina", by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva (20 copies). "Ocara Poty" (Flores Sylvestres), by Dr. Narciso R. Colmán (1 copy in 2 volumes). "Viagens Ethnographicas Sul-Americanas" (Bolivia-Argentina), by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva (20 copies). "A bem da Ethnographia Brasileira e dos Estudos Americanistas", by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva (20 copies).

The Twentieth session of the Congresso Internacional de Americanistas will be held at Rio de Janeiro, August 20-30, 1922, by postponement from June 18-30, 1920. The organizing committee is composed of the following gentlemen: president, Senator Lauro Müller; first vice president, Marshall G. Thaumaturgo de Azevedo; second vice president, Dr. A. Carlos Simoens da Silva; third vice president, Dr. Antonio Pacheco Leão; secretary general, Dr. Sergio de Carvalho; first treasurer, Dr. Antonio A. Serpa Pinto; second treasurer, Dr. Alfredo Lisboa; first secretary, Dr. Luiz Palmier; second secretary, Dr. Francisco Bhering; third secretary, Dr. A. Morales de los Rios. The program, which was approved on September 19, 1919, follows:

History and Geography

1. Forerunners of Cabral, chronology and log of their explorations along the Brazilian coast, investigations relative to the places explored, and to the native tribes occupying them.

2. Historical documentation with respect to the two first Portuguese expeditions to Brazil, and the discovery with indication of the various commanders.
3. Portugal in defense of the Brazilian territory against foreign invasions, during the colonial period.
4. The native with relation to the history of Brazil.
5. Historical deeds of the religious missions of America which have a bearing on American ethnography and civilization.
6. Origin and organization of the old province of Maynas and its influence on the ethnography of the upper Marañon and of the Solimões.
7. Early explorations of Northern Brazil and its settlement.
8. Social condition of the natives in Brazil since the discovery.
9. Action of the religious congregations of the old vice-royalty of Quito, with respect to the natives of the valley of the Marañon and their aid for the ethnography of Peru, Ecuador, and Brazil.
10. History of the expeditions which preceded the definitive settling of the estuary of Rio de la Plata.
11. The old Carmelite missions of the Amazon country as to their history, and ethnography, and with respect to the territorial claims of Brazil in the upper Solimões.
12. The old native villages and their function in the early settling of Brazil.
13. Anthro-po-geography of the native tribes of the Amazon and its tributaries, at the time of Orellana's voyage.
14. Exploration of the Amazon basin from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, and its historical, geographical, and ethnographical documentation.
15. The Orinoco, with respect to the geography, history, and ethnography of South America.
16. Anthro-po-geography of the estuaries of the Amazon, São Francisco, and la Plata in the sixteenth century.
17. Hydrography of the region of the upper Marañon, in connection with the anthro-po-geography of its several tribes, in the sixteenth century and at present.
18. The Cordillera of the Andes as a highway of the migrations and the center for dispersal of pre-Columbian races.
19. Geography and ethnography of the eastern valley of the Andes, at the time of the conquest and during the twentieth century.
20. Cartography of the dwellings of the natives of America, with respect to their form, architecture, and construction materials.
21. Labors of the Rondon Commission and its influence on Brazilian geography, cartography, and ethnography.
22. Geographic distribution of the natives of the territory of Rio de Janeiro, from the sixteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century.
23. Contribution of the latest geographic explorations carried on in the state of São Paulo, to the hydrographic and ethnographic studies of Brazil.
24. The philosophic voyage of Dr. Alexandre Rodrigues Ferreira and its results in the systematizing of ethnographic studies in Brazil.
25. Evolution of geography and cartography in North America.
26. Proofs of the development of geographic and cartographic studies in South America.
27. Geographical distribution of the native tribes of Brazil in the sixteenth century and at present.

Anthropology and Ethnography

1. The cephalic index in the anthropology of the natives of America.
2. Head deformation among ancient American races and its survival among natives of the present day.
3. Ethnic mutilations in America.
4. Can the descriptive and somatic characters of the natives of America define their racial origin?
5. Anthropological factors of the Brazilian population, and the influence of each one in the national civilization of Brazil.
6. Ethnic revivals in the usages and customs of the inland population of Brazil.
7. Anthro-po-sociology with respect to American civilization.
8. Geographic and ethnographic observations concerning communications between South Brazil and the territories of the basins of the Paraguay, Parana, and Rio de la Plata in the sixteenth century.
9. Influence of crossings in the ethnic and social formation of American populations.
10. Ethnogeny and ethnography of the inland peoples of Brazil.
11. Vestiges of crossing between ancient tribes of America and the early colonizers.
12. Chief extinct tribes of the Amazon basin.
13. Ancient civilizations and races of Peru.
14. Political importance of anthropology in America.
15. Ethnography of the so-called Tapuyas tribes of northeast Brazil in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
16. Pre-Columbian Chile.
17. Comparative ethnography of the Araucanos, Quichuas, Aymaras, and Chibchas.
18. Religious cults among the natives of America.
19. Anthropological, ethnographical, and archeological proofs of Asiatic and Polynesian migrations to pre-Columbian America.
20. Ethnography and anthropology of the Argentine Republic.
21. Actual condition of paleoethnological, anthropological, and ethnographical studies in the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.
22. Ethnography and anthropology of the Charruas.
23. Study of medicine men and their practices in South America.
24. Legends, myths, and cosmogonic stories of native tribes in South America.
25. The culture of industrial plants among the natives of Brazil at the time of the discovery.
26. Medicinal flora of the natives of Brazil.
27. Study of healing materials of vegetable origin in use among the natives of Brazil and of the plants from which they come.
28. Ethnography and anthropology of the principal tribes of the interandine tableland at the time of the conquest.
29. Anthropology, ethnography, and linguistics of the Tupys of the Brazilian coast and of the Guaranys of the southern part of the continent.
30. Jewish rites among American natives.
31. Pedagoic anthropology in South America.
32. Pre-Columbian migrations from the continent of North America and from the Antilles to South America.
33. Folklore of the natives of South America.

Paleoethnology and Archeology

1. Paleolithic and neolithic industry in pre-Columbian America.
2. Contemporaneousness of man and the quaternary mammals in America, in accordance with the most recent investigations.
3. Do specimens of the stone age in Brazil permit of their classification into two distinct periods, namely the peoleolithic and the neolithic?
4. The megalithic monuments of America and their buliders.
5. Proofs of the glacial periods and of prehistoric man in North America.
6. Comparative study of the ceramic products of pre-Columbian America.
7. Do the problems of the eoliths and of tertiary man find support in American paleoethnology.
8. Ornamental ceramic art of the burial mounds of the Amazon country.
9. Parallel between the prehistoric ceramics of Brazil and of the natives of the present time.
10. Comparative paleoethnology: mounds and kitchenmiddins of North America.—Sambaquis and burial mounds of Brazil.
11. The art of casting and molding gold in pre-Columbian America.
12. Comparative study of the civilizations of Chile, Peru, and Ecuador, prior to the domination of the Incas.
13. Burial or funeral rites in pre-Columbian America and among the American natives of the present time.
14. Paleoethnology and anthropology in the latest explorations of the limestone caves of America.
15. Totemism and magic among native American tribes.
16. Excavations of the rocks of "San Angel" and the archaic culture of the Valley of Mexico.
17. Extinct races of America. The Taironas.
18. Prehispanic remains in the southern regions of South America.
19. Working of copper, bronze, and meteoric iron in prehistoric America.
20. Stone age in the Antilles.
21. The hypotheses of Atlantis studied with the aid of geology, paleoethnology, and history.

Linguistics and Paleography

1. The expeditions of Commissioner Von den Stein to Central Brazil, and his linguistic, geographic, and ethnographic contribution.
2. American man with respect to linguistics.
3. Linguistic, anthropological, and ethnographical differentiation between the Carahybas and the Tupys.
4. With what linguistic family should the language of the Omaguas be affiliated?
5. Most recent investigations with respect to the ancient Mexican writing, and the elements entering into it.
6. Most recent studies on the language of the Maynas Indians.
7. Aid rendered by the latest expeditions to America for the linguistic classification of the American natives.
8. Wall sculptures and paintings of the neolithic caves of America and their interpretation.

9. Lapidary inscriptions (petroglyphs) of Brazil.
10. Synthesis of modern studies on the hieroglyphic writing in use among the ancient American races.

The following theses were also presented and accepted:

- The Crenac Tribe (Botocudos Indians), region of Rio Doce. Presented by Dr. Antonio Carlos Simoens da Silva.
- Origin of Brazilian towns. Presented by Professor Dr. Morales de los Rios.
- The so-called Canoeiros Indians never existed in Goyaz, and do not exist in Brazil. Presented by Col. Dr. Henrique Silva.
- The origins of Brazilian society. Presented by Dr. Elysio de Carvalho.
- The first attempts for the establishment of the iron manufacturing industry in Brazil. Presented by Dr. Elysio de Carvalho.
- Influence of the reigns of the Felipes of Spain, as a cause of natural decay in the agreements of the treaty of Tordesillas and for the increase of Brazilian territory. Presented by Professor Dr. Morales de los Rios.
- What standard should be observed as a basis for the scientific taxonomic system for the classification of the native American peoples? Presented by Dr. João Barbosa de Faria.
- The native problem in Brazil since the independence. Presented by Dr. Luiz Bueno Horta Barbosa.
- Prehistoric and ethnological relations which were discovered in the villages of the Island of Marajó, the deposits and caves of Santarem, and of the peninsula of Tihalmiunau, influencing Indo-European migrations. Presented by Professor Dr. Morales de los Rios.

Any member of the Congress may select any subject for his dissertation not included in the program, provided that it be related to the matters comprehended therein.

The papers presented to the Congress should cover not over twenty sheets of typewritten paper at the maximum, and the time allowed for the reading of each paper must not exceed fifteen or twenty minutes.

Whenever a paper, because of the nature of the matter treated therein, surpasses these limits, the author shall not fail to send his paper to the office of the committee, informing the congress of the matter treated, its chief points and its conclusions, in a written or oral summary.

Authors who can not attend the sessions of the congress should send their papers to the secretary general. . . .

A number of historical scholars of the United States will present papers at the Brazilian Historical Congress, including Charles Lyon Chandler, N. Andrew N. Cleven, Julius Klein, Percy A. Martin, William

Lytle Schurz, Mary Wilhelmine Williams, and others. There will be present as delegates from various institutions of the United States to one or another of the congresses a number of well known scholars. Among universities that will be represented by special delegates, we have already heard of California, Harvard, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Pittsburgh, and Northwestern, while the Carnegie Foundation of International Peace will send the following gentlemen as delegates to the Congresso de Americanistas: Dr. Walter Hough, Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, Dr. H. J. Spinden, and Dr. Mitchell Carroll. Dr. M. H. Saville will represent the Heye Foundation, and Dr. W. P. Wilson, the Commercial Museum of Philadelphia.

Below are the Agenda of the First Pan-Pacific Commercial Conference, which has been called by the Pan-Pacific Union to meet in Honolulu, Hawaii, October 25, 1922, and dates of steamship sailings for all countries of the Pacific, which will enable delegates to book their passage well in advance. The director of the Conference is Mr. Alexander Hume Ford, editor of the Pan-Pacific Magazine. Adequate entertainment has been provided for delegates, over the dates October 24 to November 8.

AGENDA

Opening Day—Wednesday, October 25

General Topic—Significant Pan-Pacific Commercial Problems of My Country. (One speaker from each country to give a brief paper.)

Second Day—Thursday, October 26

General Topic—Communication and Transportation.

1. Survey of existing cable and wireless facilities, with suggestions for meeting present deficiencies.
2. Establishment of lower special rates, fixing responsibility and granting general improved facilities for the press.

3. An analysis of present trade routes and the development of possible new routes.

4. Desirability of free zones or free ports in Pacific lands.

Third Day—Friday, October 27

General Topic—Development and conservation of natural resources.

1. Methods to be employed in saving the Pan-Pacific fisheries.
2. Development of Pan-Pacific fuel resources in order to provide for future expansion of Pacific industry and transportation.
3. Steps to be taken toward prevention of crises in the world rice and sugar situation.

*Fourth Day—Monday October 30**General Topic—Finance and Investments.*

1. Measures to be followed for relieving exchange difficulties.
2. The need for greater uniformity in bills of exchange and other commercial documents.
3. Terms of credit in Pan-Pacific area as an aid to foreign trade.
4. Standardization of trade certificates. How to insure reliability.

*Fifth Day—Tuesday, October 31
(Last Session)**General Topic—Inter-nation relations in the Pan-Pacific area.*

1. Arbitration of commercial misunderstandings.
2. The need for coöperation among the various agencies interested in Pan-Pacific problems.
3. Reports of special committees.
4. Resolutions including recommendations for legislation.

STEAMSHIP SAILINGS

It is expected that the American delegation will sail in a body from San Francisco on the Matsun liner Maui about 10 a.m., Wednesday, October 18. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce will secure reservations for delegates, and it is expected that President Wallace Alexander of the San Francisco Chamber will accompany the delegates to Honolulu.

From China and Japan the S. S. Tenyo Maru of the Toyo Kisen Kaisha will arrive in Honolulu October 25th. She will sail from Hongkong on October 4, from Shanghai on October 8, from Yokohama on October 16. Manila delegates may make connection at Hongkong. Delegates from Siam, Malay, and Java, will connect at Hongkong.

The China Mail S. S. Co. will dispatch the Nanking from Shanghai about October 23, and she is due in Honolulu about Nov. 7.

The Pacific Mail Steamer Empire State will leave Manila about Sept. 28, Hongkong about Oct. 4, Shanghai about Oct. 7, and Yokohama about Oct. 12, arriving in Honolulu Oct. 20.

From Australia the Oceanic liner Sonoma will leave Sydney about Sept. 13, arriving in Honolulu Sept. 26, or the Ventura will leave Sydney October 17, arriving in Honolulu October 31.

From Auckland, Sydney and Fiji, the Canadian Australian liner Makura will sail from Sydney, September 21, from Auckland, September 26, arriving in Honolulu October 7th.

From South American ports the Toyo Kisen Kaisha, Seiyo Maru will arrive in Honolulu about October 1, leaving Valparaiso Aug. 9, Iquique, Chile, August 21, Balboa September 2.

The Canadian-Australian liner Niagara will leave Vancouver and Victoria about Sept. 22 arriving in Honolulu about Sept. 30, and the Makura will leave October 20, arriving in Honolulu October 28.

Sr. D. Nester Carbonell has been sent by the municipality of Havana to the Archives of the Indies at Seville, Spain, to study documents referring to that city's history prior to 1550. In 1550 Sores in burning

Havana burnt also its records, which, after that date, are consecutive. Sr. Carbonell expects to finish his commission by September.

Miss Irene A. Wright continues her work of investigation in the Archivo General de Indias at Seville. She is still working among Florida papers on commission for Mrs. Washington E. Connor, and has lately undertaken additional work also among Florida documents, for Mr. John B. Stetson, Jr. Mrs. Connor and Mr. Stetson are collaborating, to avoid duplication, and together are thoroughly cleaning up a considerable section of the Archives, Mrs. Connor working especially among *Audiencia de Santo Domingo* papers and Mr. Stetson among the royal *cedulas* which complement them. In supplementary work, Mrs. Connor prefers East Florida and Mr. Stetson, West Florida. It is their intention to gather together on this side the water a collection of transcripts complete enough to enable students in the United States to work intelligently on the history of Spanish Florida.

Rev. Constantino Bayle, S.J. of Madrid, editor of the Hispanic American History section of the Jesuit review *Razón y Fe*, which is published in Madrid, is desirous of establishing an exchange with magazines and reviews interested in the above mentioned field and of receiving for review books, pamphlets, and magazine articles dealing with the history of Hispanic America. His address is *Razón y Fe*, Alberto Aguilera, Madrid.

Professor Charles E. Chapman has returned from Nicaragua, and is offering courses in Columbia University during the summer session.

Professor Halford L. Hoskins, of Tufts University is offering courses in the Cleveland School of Education and Western University during the summer.

Dr. Julius Klein, of Harvard University and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, announces that he has discovered a considerable amount of material relative to the operations of the Mesta in Mexico. As soon as his strenuous duties permit, he will gather this material together and present it to the public through the medium of this REVIEW. A review of Dr. Klein's *Mesta* will be found in the May number of this REVIEW.

Among the special lecturers of the Institute of Politics this year at Williamstown, Massachusetts, will be Dr. Manoel de Oliveira Lima. Dr. Oliveira Lima will lecture on the following subjects:

- I. Brazilian Independence Movement in relation to the Emancipation of the New World.
- II. Brazil's Foreign Policy with special reference to neighboring Latin-America Republics.
- III. Brazil's Foreign Policy with special reference to her relations with the United States.
- IV. Racial and Social Questions in Brazil.
- V. Brazil's Economic and Financial problems.
- VI. Pan-Americanism as a Continental Doctrine.

Professor W. W. Pierson, Jr., in the absence of Dr. Greenlaw, acted as Dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina during the last quarter of the year just passed, in addition to carrying his regular duties. The Library of the University has recently purchased about two hundred volumes relating to the Spanish institution of the *Cabildo*. An article on the *Cabildo* by Dr. Pierson will soon appear in the *REVIEW*.

At the Festival of the Portuguese Language, held at Earl Hall, Columbia University, March 18, 1922, by the Pan American Student League, the final address was delivered by a brilliant Brazilian student, namely, Gilberto de M. Freyre. Among other things, Mr. Freyre said:

This festival is also one of true fraternity among many nations: between Portugal and Brazil; between those who speak Portuguese and those who speak Spanish, that beloved sister language of ours; between all the Hispanic nations and the United States. It is Pan-Hispanic and Pan-American. We believe that Pan-Americanism should be more than a fair sounding disguise for commercial advantages; we believe in it as a fraternity of souls, and the soul of a people is in its language. This is why this league of young men—that is to say, a league of *Don Quixotes*—decided to open a department of Portuguese studies: to cooperate with well established societies in the gathering and disseminating of information concerning the language and literatures of Portugal and Brazil.

The time is ripe for such work as the League proposes, and that body can do much, if its resolution be kept, to promote the study of the Portuguese language and the literatures of Portugal and Brazil. It should also include in its program the history of the two countries. The efforts of the League to promote a real Pan-Americanism should be applauded by all Americans, whether of the Southern or the Northern continent. Sr. Freyre has recently gone to Europe for a period of travel, after which he plans to return to Brazil.

CHILEAN LITERATURE; A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERARY CRITICISM, BIOGRAPHY, AND LITERARY CONTROVERSY

PART III

615. Melcherts, Gustavo. *Lastarria (Conferencia leída en el Liceo de Valparaíso el 31 de Julio de 1916)*. Valparaíso, Imp. Iberia, 1916. Pamphlet of 16 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*].
616. Méndez, Martínez N. *Un Danubio azul de autores*. Santiago, Imp. de los Tiempos, 1879. 8°. 25 p.

Jottings in a semi-humorous vein about seventeen Chilean works.

617. Meza Fuentes, R. *La luna de otoño*, por Félix Armando Núñez. *Juventud*, I. No. 4, 88-90.
618. ———— *Anunciación*, versos por Renato Monastier. *Ibid.*, I. No. 6, 94-7.
619. ———— *La mirada inmóvil*, poesías por Juan Guzmán Cruchaga. *Ibid.*, I. No. 6, 97-8.
620. ———— Francisco Contreras. *Ibid.*, II. No. 8, 57-68.
621. Molina, Justo. *La Aurora de Chile* (Periódico ministerial i político). *Est. de Ch.*, VI, 622-4, 625-30.
622. Molina, M. Relaciones literarias entre los pueblos latino-americanos. *Rev. de A. y L.*, V, 253-68.
623. Molina Núñez, Julio and Araya, Juan Agustín ("O. Segura Castro"). *Selva lírica. Estudios sobre los poetas chilenos*. Santiago, Soc. Imp. y Lit. Universo, 1917. 8°. XXVI + 488 p.

Biographies, many of them very complete, of ninety-four modern Chilean poets, with selections. This part of the volume is followed by brief biographies of over one hundred poets not included in the first. The work concludes with a short account of the *Ateneo* of Santiago, the *Consejo Superior de Letras y Bellas Artes* and the *Concursos poéticos* held in Chile from May, 1842, to September, 1915.

624. Montt, Enrique. *La Constitución ante el Congreso*, por Jorge Huneeus y Zegers. *Los Tiempos*, Aug. 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 1880. Also published in Tondreau, *À la memoria de Don Jorge Huneeus*.
625. ———— Don Andrés Bello, su vida y sus obras. *Rev. (I) de Ch.*, II. 235-59, 321-41.
626. Montt, Lorenzo. Algunas consideraciones sobre la poesía americana. *Rev. de A. y L.*, III. 550-4.
627. Montt, Luis. *Ensayo sobre la vida i escritos de Camilo Henríquez*. Santiago, Imp. del Ferrocarril, 1872. 8°. 131 p.

Based largely on M. L. Amunátegui's biography of Henríquez, but with a considerable amount of additional material.

628. ——— Mariano Egaña. Published in *Suscripción de la Academia de Bellas Letras*. . . .
629. ——— Primeros cronistas de Chile. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, VI. 202-13.
630. ——— Biographies of Santiago de Tesillo, Juan de Jesús María, Jerónimo de Quiroga, José Basilio de Rojas, and Juan Ignacio Molina. *Col. de Hist. de Ch.*, XI. Santiago, 1878. XXIV + 528 p.
631. ——— *Homenaje á Sarmiento. Sarmiento en Chile*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Gutenberg, 1888. 18°. 38 p.

Brief mention of Sarmiento's various activities in Chile.

632. ——— Biografía de Vicente Pérez Rosales. Introduction to Vicente Pérez Rosales, *Recuerdos del pasado*. [Biblioteca de Escritores de Chile, III.] Santiago de Chile, Imp. Barcelona, 1910. XXIV + 507 p.
633. Morales, Raimundo. *Críticas y discursos*. Tomo I. Santiago, Imp. S. Buenaventura, 1916. 16°. V + 452 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*].
634. Morales Vera, Pedro P. *Libro de lectura de biografías para las escuelas*. Santiago de Chile. Imp. Universitaria. 1911. 8°. 110 p.

Brief biographies of thirty-five men and women. Includes the following literary figures: M. L. Amunátegui, Mariano Casanova, E. Lillo, B. Vicuña Mackenna, D. Barros Arana, José Bernardo Suárez, and Ernesto Riquelme.

635. Muñoz Donoso, Esteban. Crítica literaria. Reparos contra reparos. *Rev. (3) Cat.*, XIII. 524-31, 596-611, 676-83, 751-58, 833-42, 915-27; XIV. 25-42, 112-27, 188-206.

An answer to articles by Fermándoiz and Creso (*q. v.*), dealing with the epic poem *La Colombia*.

636. Muñoz, Juan Ramón. Poetizas chilenas. *Rev. de S. A.*, I. 163-4.
637. Murillo, A. La última enfermedad de Bello. Published in *Suscripción de la Academia de Bellas Letras*. . . .
638. "N". Alfredo Andueza, *El Crisol*. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, VII. 130-1.
639. Nercasseau y Morán, Enrique. Dos novelas y dos novelistas. *Marianita*, de Don Vicente Grez; *Ventura*, de Don Alejandro Silva de la Fuente. *Rev. de A. y L.*, V. 102-14.
640. ——— Lastarria. *Ibid.*, XIII. 61-72.
641. ——— *La mejor espuela* [Comedy by M. Antonio Benavides]. *Est. de Ch.*, VII. 561-4.
642. ——— *La virgen de Andacollo*, por Don Juan Ramón Martínez. *Ibid.*, VII. 638-42.
643. ——— Biography of Adolfo Valderrama. Introduction to *Obras escogidas*. . . de A. Valderrama.
644. ——— Conferencia sobre la poesía en jeneral, i en especial sobre las de don Guillermo Blest Gana. *Anal. de la Univ.*, CXIX. 241-54.
645. ——— Discurso. . . . *Bol. de la Acad. Chil.*, I. 311-24.

Biography of Z. Rodríguez followed by a discussion of the picaresque novel in Spain.

646. Nieto del Río, Félix. *Crónicas literarias. Prólogo de Don Paulino Alfonso*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Cervantes, 1912. 8°. XI + 259 p.

"*La vida íntima de Marie Goetz*, by Mariana Cox (Shade)", p. 13-23.

"*Horas perdidas*, versos [by Allán Samadhy]", p. 25-40.

- "*Juventud*, poesías [by Max Jara]", p. 41-5.
 "Cuesta arriba [by E. Rodríguez Mendoza]", p. 59-67.
 "Un hermoso libro [*Ironía y sentimiento* by Ángel C. Espejo]", p. 85-90.
 "Algo sobre Iris y sus últimos libros", p. 91-102.
 "*Almas y panoramas* [by Francisco Contreras]", p. 113-20.
 "*Buen humor* por Maltrana [A. C. Espejo]", p. 120-32.

"Omer Emeth". See Emilio Vaïsse.

647. Opaso, Bernardino. El señor Don Andrés Bello considerado especialmente como jurisconsulto, publicista, diplomático, codificador, etc. Discurso. . . . *Anal. de la Univ.*, XXVIII. 1886, 435-54.
 648. Orrego Barros, Antonio. Recuerdos de Guillermo Blest Gana. Intro. to Vol. I. of *Obras Completas* . . . de Blest Gana. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Cervantes, 1907. 8°. XV + 400 p.
 649. ———. Biografía de Guillermo Blest Gana. Introduction to Vol. II. of *Obras Completas* de . . . XLIII + 434 p.
 650. Orrego Luco, Augusto. Francisco Bilbao. Á propósito de las publicaciones de don Zorababel Rodríguez i don E. de la Barra. *Rev. (2) de Sant.*, I. 730-47.
 651. ———. *Poesías líricas*, por Víctor Torres Arce. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, XI. 157-8.
 652. ———. El Padre López. Estudio sobre la poesía colonial. *Ibid.*, XI. 274-306.
 653. ———. Literatura dramática. Dictamen del jurado. See Lastarria, *Obras*, XI.
 654. ———. *Amunátegui*. Santiago, Imp. de la Época, 1888. 16°. 78 p.

Also published in the volume *Retratos* (q.v.).

655. ———. El movimiento literario de 1842. Páginas de un libro próximo á aparecer. *Rev. del Prog.*, IV. 100-50.
 656. ———. *Bosquejo del desarrollo intelectual de Chile*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Nacional, 1889. 4°. 176 p. (Unfinished).

Only four or five copies of this book are known to exist. The library of the *Instituto Pedagógico* possesses the only one outside of private collections. Señor Orrego Luco still has in his possession the original manuscript and states that about a hundred and fifty pages more were to be printed.

After a brief introduction the author deals with the activities of Mora in Chile; Bello's arrival; the early days of the National Theater; publications of various kinds during the period 1831-42; Lastarria, Benavente, Sarmiento and the literary movement of 1842; the works of Sanfuentes, Vallejo, C. Bello, Minvielle, Santiago Lindsey, Ramón Francisco Ovalle; the University and the clergy in this movement; *El Crepúsculo* and its contributors; Bello's *Oración por todos*; Bilbao and his activities; the works of Lastarria; *Memorias* presented at the University; the press of 1844; M. Blanco Cuartín; M. L. Amunátegui; J. A. Torres; G. Blest Gana; J. Blest Gana; A. Montt; D. Barros Arana; G. Matta; Martín José Lira; A. Valderrama; D. Santa María; Santiago Godoy; Ignacio Zenteno; R. Sotomayor Valdés; and Isidoro Errázuriz.

657. ———. Un grupo de periodistas: Jotabeche; Isidoro Errázuriz; Justo i Domingo Arteaga. *Rev. Nueva* I. 23-38.
 658. ———. Eduardo de la Barra. *Ibid.*, I. 177-88.
 659. ———. Isidoro Errázuriz. Introduction to Vol. I. of Errázuriz, *Obras*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Barcelona, 1910. 8°. XXXII + 322 p. + Ind.

660. ——— *Retratos: Amundéguí; Gambetta; Cánovas del Castillo; J. M. Charcot; D. J. Victorino Lastarria; D. Simón Rodríguez.* Santiago, Ediciones de la Revista Chilena, 1917. 8°. 290 p. + Ind.

"M. L. Amunátegui", p. 1-57. In this article Orrego Luco deals especially with Amunátegui's political activities but includes a brief characterization of his works.

"Don J. Victorino Lastarria", pp. 191-239. Personal recollections of the man. Also published in the *Rev. (9) Chil.* I. 5-47, under the title "Don Victorino Lastarria. Impresiones y recuerdos".

661. ——— *Discurso . . . Bol. de la Acad. Chil., II.* 215-49.

Biography of Sotomayor Valdés with some account of his literary activities.

662. O'Ryan, Juan Enrique. *Don Juan de Mendoza Monteagudo* [*Biblioteca de la Palabra*]. Valparaíso, Imp. de la Patria, MDCCCXCVIII. 16°. 31 p.

"El autor de las *Guerras de Chile* . . . ¿es Juan de Mendoza Monteagudo? Tal se ha creído hasta ahora i dicho nombre se ha puesto en la portada de aquella publicación: pero un análisis prolijo de los hechos que parecían demostrarlo; una lectura i estudio concienzudos del *Compendio historial del descubrimiento del reino de Chile*, del Capitán don Melchor Jufre del Águila, . . . i, en fin la investigación discreta i afortunada, con datos nuevos, que ha hecho el señor O'Ryan prueban evidentemente, que dicha creencia es completamente errónea". E. Blanchard Chessi, *Notas bibliográficas de la literatura chilena. Sobre "Don Juan de Mendoza Monteagudo"*. . . . de Juan Enrique O'Ryan. Santiago de Chile, Imp. de la Ilustración Militar, 1899. Pamphlet of 7 p.

663. Ovalle Castillo, Francisco Javier. *El notable historiador chileno Diego Barros Arana* (*Apuntes para una biografía*). Santiago de Chile, Imp. Cervantes, 1915. 8°. 104 p.

The various phases of his career with a certain amount of characterization.

664. ——— *Inés Echeverría de Larraín* (*Iris en la República de las Letras*). Santiago, Imp. Universitaria, 1918. 8°. 101 p.

Eulogy of "Iris" with a few facts about her husband and parents, followed by general remarks about her works.

665. ——— *Inez Echeverría de Larraín* (*Iris*) *ante sus detractores. Alrededor del ataque literario del Señor Pedro Nolasco Cruz.* Santiago de Chile, Imp. Universitaria, 1918. 8°. 32 p.

The occasion of the publication of this pamphlet was an unfavorable article by P. N. Cruz in the *Diario Ilustrado* of June 29, 1918. Ovalle defends the style of "Iris" but the violence of his attack on Cruz weakens his position.

666. ——— *La personalidad de don Marcial Martínez* (*Jurisconsulto y hombre de estado, chileno*). Santiago, Imp. Universitaria, 1918. 140 × 80 mm. 136 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]

667. ——— *La Sociedad Chilena. Retratos de mujeres ilustres.* Santiago, Imp. Universitaria, 1919. 8°. 90 p. With twenty full-page portraits.

Eulogies of twenty-three women with a minimum of biographical detail. In the list figure Lucía Bulnes de Vegara, Inés Echeverría de Larraín, María Luisa Fernández de García Huidobro, and Estela Vicuña de Vicuña.

668. Palacios, Senén. El autor de la *Raza Chilena*, Dr. Nicolás Palacios. Recuerdos íntimos. *Rev. (2) Chil.*, March, 1918. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
 669. Palma, Martín. *Los oradores del cincuenta y ocho*. Valparaíso, Imp. y Lib. del Mercurio, 1860. 4°. 40 p.

A characterization, without biographical details, of the following men: Antonio Varas, Alejandro Reyes, Eugenio Vergara, Manuel A. Matta, Matías Ovalle, Jerónimo Urmeneta, Domingo Santa María, Álvaro Covarrubias, Ángel C. Gallo, José V. Lastarria, Juan Herrera, Francisco Marín and Waldo Silva. First published in the *Rev. del Pacíf.*, II.

"Par, Leo". See Ricardo Dávila Silva.

670. Pardo, Eduardo. Del modernismo en América. *Rev. Nueva*, VII. 103-10.
 671. Passi García, Ricardo. Los novelistas (*María—Cartas á un amigo*, por Adolfo Valderrama). *Rev. (1) Chil.*, XV. 215-18.
 672. ——— Don Jorje Huneeus. Á propósito de un libro [*La Constitución ante el Congreso*]. *Ibid.*, XVI. 296-302.
 673. ——— Los positivistas. Don Guillermo Matta. *Los Tiempos*, Oct. 1, 1879.
 674. ——— *Diego Barros Arana*. Santiago, Imp. de la Lib. Americana, 1884. 8°. 45 p. [Anrique i Silva, *Ensayo* . . .].
 675. Peña Munizaga, Nicolás. Semblanzas literarias. Luis Orrego Luco. *Rev. Nueva*, IV. 561-72.
 676. ——— J. J. Vallejo, *Obras precedidas de un estudio biográfico* [by A. Edwards]. *Rev. Chil. de H. y G.*, I. No. 3.
 677. ——— Introduction to *Teatro dramático nacional* [*Biblioteca de Escritores de Chile. IX.*] Santiago de Chile, Imp. Barcelona, Año 1912. 8°. CXXXIII + 539 p. + Ind.

Dramatic representations in colonial times; first plays during the period of independence; Camilo Henríquez; attitude of the clergy; the first national play, *La hija del sur*, with analysis; Mora and Bello and their encouragement of the theater; the theater of Arteaga, actors and repertory; translations of the Argentine, Hilarión Moreno; Sarmiento and Chilean literature; C. Bello and *Los amores del poeta*; Minvielle and his dramatic works; E. Lillo's *San Bruno*, with analysis; plays of S. Sanfuentes; analysis of *Cora o la virgen del sol*; J. A. Torres Arce, G. and A. Blest Gana and their dramatic works; Barros Grez; C. Walker Martínez; Antonio Espíñeira; Juan Rafael Allende; other national writers; Daniel Caldera. In conclusion the author analyses the plays published in the volume: *Camila o la patriota de Sud-América*, by C. Henríquez; *Los amores del poeta*, by C. Bello; *Ernesto*, by R. Minvielle; *Juana de Nápoles*, by S. Sanfuentes; *La Independencia de Chile*, by J. A. Torres; *La conjuración de Almagro*, by G. Blest Gana; *Manuel Rodríguez*, by C. Walker Martínez; and, *El tribunal de honor* by D. Caldera.

678. ——— Crónica literaria. *Laudatorias heroicas*, por Antonio Bórquez Solar. *Rev. (2) Chil.*, V. 268-74.
 679. ——— Crónica . . . Pedro Antonio González. *Ibid.*, VI. 265-72.
 680. ——— Crónica . . . *Cantos del camino*, por Luis Felipe Contado. *Ibid.*, VII. 118-25.
 681. Pereira, Luis. Diego José Benavente. Discurso . . . *Anal. de la Univ.*, 1869, 445ff.
 682. Pinto Durán, Antonio. Don Crescente Errázuriz. *Juventud*, I. No. 6, 57-63.

683. Polanco Casanova, Rodolfo. *Ojeada crítica sobre la poesía en Chile, 1840-1912. Estudio premiado por el Consejo Superior de Letras i Bellas Artes en el Certamen de 1912.* Santiago, Imp. Barcelona, 1913. 8°. 71 p.

This study was also published in the *Anal. de la Univ.*, CXXXII. 538-67; and, CXXXIII. 1-39.

The author deals at some length with S. Sanfuentes, E. de la Barra, and Pedro Antonio González, characterizing in a general way their productions and quoting from them; briefly touching upon the minor poets. Without entering into a discussion of influence, inspiration, schools of poetry or tendencies of a particular period he arrives at three conclusions: "I. En Chile no hai poetas trascendentales o universales como aquellos grandes maestros que veneran muchos pueblos i diversas razas, que no son únicamente poetas de una nación, sino poetas de la humanidad. II. Poseemos tres poetas cumbres, que no tienen superiores en su jénero en la América del Sur: Salvador Sanfuentes, en la leyenda nacional, Eduardo de la Barra, en el jénero sujestivo i Pedro Antonio González en el lirismo filosófico. III. En la actual jeneración hai por lo menos una veintena de poetas de esclarecido talento, que pueden competir honrosamente, en el palenque de las ideas, con los poetas de cualquiera república vecina".

684. Ponce, Manuel Antonio. *Educadores americanos. Sarmiento i sus doctrinas pedagógicas.* Valparaíso, Imp. i Lib. Americana, 1890. 8°. 179 p.

A biography of Sarmiento, dealing more especially with his educational activities.

685. ———. *Sarmiento en Chile. Prólogo al Tomo XXVIII de sus obras.* Buenos Aires, Imp. Mariano Moreno, 1899. 8°. 26 p.

A reprint, largely confined to the works on education written by Sarmiento during his stay in Chile.

686. Prado, Pedro. Los X y Omer Emeth. *Los Diez*, No. 8, IV. 350-2.

687. Prats Bello, Ana Luisa. *Andrés Bello (Estudio biográfico), 1781-1865.* Santiago, Imp. Universitaria, 1916. 140 × 80 mm. 77 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*].

688. Préndez, P. Nolasco. *Los candidatos liberales para 1885.* Valparaíso, Imp. de la Patria, 1885. 8°. 250 p.

A series of brief biographies, including the following literary men: Vicente Grez, Julio Bañados Espinosa, Augusto Orrego Luco, and Adolfo Valderrama.

689. Prieto, Luis Francisco. *Muestras de errores y defectos del Diccionario Biográfico Colonial de Chile por José Toribio Medina.* Santiago, Imp. y Enc. Chile, 1907. 8°. 124 p.

The bitterness of the closing chapter, in which the author attacks other works of Medina, does not argue favorably for his fairmindedness.

690. ———. ¿Cómo se llamaba la madre del Abate Molina? *Rev. Chil. de H. y G.*, XV. 365-8.

691. Puga Borne, Federico. Don Marcial Martínez. *Rev. (2) Chil.*, June, 1918.

692. Ramírez Cortés, Mariano. *Juicio crítico de las poesías de Guillermo Matta.* Santiago, Imp. del Ferrocarril, Diciembre de 1862. 4°. 51 p.

A rare book, a copy of which is in the library of the *Instituto Pedagógico*.

After touching upon the critical observations of the Amunátegui brothers, the author attempts to establish a resemblance between Matta's poems and those of Espronceda.

693. Ramírez Sosa, Augusto ("Cucalón"). *José Romero. Drama en tres actos y en verso por Juan Rafael Allende. Los Tiempos*, May 5, 1880.

694. "Redacción de la *Estrella de Chile*." *Los orígenes de la iglesia chilena*, por Crescente Errázuriz. *Est. de Ch.*, VI. 476-7.
695. ——— Los literatos mejicanos i la poetisa chilena Doña Mercedes Marín de Solar. *Ibid.*, VII. 105-7.
696. "Redacción de la *Revista de Artes y Letras*." *Haroldo, episodio del siglo XV*, por Amelia Solar de Claro. *Rev. de A. y L.*, XII. 479-83.
697. ——— D. Amunátegui Solar. *Los primeros años del Instituto Nacional*. *Ibid.*, XVI. 598-605.
698. ——— *Estudios y ensayos literarios*, por Pedro Balmaceda Toro. *Ibid.*, XVI. 671-2.
699. Risopatrón, Carlos. Observaciones sobre las publicaciones que está haciendo el Sr. Valentín Letelier en los *Anales de la Universidad* bajo el título *Evolución de la Historia*. *Anal de la Univ.*, CVI. 705-28.
700. Rodríguez Bravo, Joaquín. *El Congreso de 1882. Retratos políticos de sus miembros*. Santiago, Imp. Victoria, 1882. 8°. XI + 324 p.
- A biography of Eusebio Lillo (p. 193-202) is of interest to Chilean literature.
701. ——— *Don José Victorino Lastarria*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Barcelona, 1892. 8°. 486 p.
- An interesting account of the life of Lastarria and the times in which he lived. In judging his literary productions the author seems to be impartial, pointing out both merits and defects.
702. Rodríguez Peña, Demetrio. De la literatura chilena, su nacionalidad, su carácter i su influencia en el progreso i felicidad del país [Estudio leído en el *Círculo de Amigos* . . . el 21 de Octubre de 1859]. *Sem.*, I. 371-7, 394-6; II. 10-13, 19-23, 33-6.
703. Rodríguez, Zorababel. Una sociedad literaria en 1825. *Est. de Ch.*, I. 87-9, 99-102. Also published in *Miscelánea* . . .
704. ——— Apuntes sobre la poesía indígena. *Ibid.*, I. 231-3, 243-4, 255-9, 266-70, 278-81. Also published in *Miscelánea* . . .
705. ——— *La Inquisición, rápida ojeada sobre aquella antigua institución* por José Ramón Saavedra. *Ibid.*, I. 290-3. Also published in *Miscelánea* . . .
706. ——— *Francisco Moyén, o lo que fué la Inquisición en América*, por B. Vicuña Mackenna. *Ibid.*, I. 458-60, 470-4, 481-5, 495-9. Also published in *Miscelánea* . . .
707. ——— *Cuentos para niños grandes*, por D. Barros Grez. *Ibid.*, II. 164-5, 246-51. Also in *Miscelánea* . . .
708. ——— *Los precursores de la Independencia de Chile*, por M. L. Amunátegui. *Ibid.*, IV. 224-8, 245-9, 755-9, 771-6, 787-90; VI. 441-8, 450-4, 465-8. Also published in *Miscelánea* . . .
709. ——— Dos poetas de poncho: Bernardino Gallardo i Juan Morales. *Ibid.*, VI. 763-6, 775-9, 823-6, 839-41, 856-9.
710. ——— Francisco Bilbao, su vida y sus doctrinas. *Est. de Ch.*, V. 581-6, 597-600, 613-6, 629-35, 645-8, 661-4, 677-80, 693-8, 709-13, 725-33.
- Francisco Bilbao . . . Santiago, Imp. de El Independiente, 1872. 8°. XXIII + 213 p.

The introduction is by Rómulo Mandiola. The biography itself, based on that of Manuel Bilbao, is followed by an account of Bilbao's doctrines and an attempt to refute them. Unfavorable in its criticism.

711. ——— *Miscelánea literaria, política i religiosa*. Santiago, Imp. de El Independiente, 1873. 2 vols. in 4°. "Dos Palabras" by Enrique Solar, V-XV + 400 p. and 408 p.

Vol. I.

- "*Guillermo Tell* . . . traducido al castellano por M. A. Matta", p. 25-34.
 "Apuntes sobre la poesía indígena de América", p. 35-89.
 "Una sociedad literaria en 1825", p. 91-111.
 "*La Inquisición* . . . por José Ramón Saavedra", p. 113-24.
 "*Francisco Moyén* . . . por B. Vicuña Mackenna", p. 125-74.
 "*Cuentos para niños grandes*, por D. Barros Grez", p. 243-66.

Vol. II.

- "*Los precursores de la Independencia de Chile*, por M. L. Amunátegui", p. 122-230.

712. ——— Poema positivista. Á propósito del volumen de versos titulado *Un poema de don Guillermo Puelma Tupper*. *Rev. de A. y L.*, XV. 233-57.
 713. Rojas, Aristides. Don Andrés Bello i los supuestos delatores de la Revolución de Venezuela. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, V. 5-42.
 714. ——— Andrés Bello. *Anal. de la Univ.*, 1880, 437ff.
 716. Rojas Molina, Armando. *Mi respuesta á los críticos*. Santiago, Imp. Chile, 1913. [*Rev. de Bibl.*].

Deals with criticism of the volume *Flores de mi huerto*. Segunda edición. Santiago, 1913.

717. Roldán, Alcibiades. Don Andrés Bello. *Rev. (1) de Ch.*, I. 565-8.
 718. ——— Benjamín Dávila Larraín. Published in *Corona fúnebre á la memoria de . . . Larraín*.
 719. Román Blanco, Floridor. El libro de *Poésias líricas* de José A. Soffia. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, VI. 89-110.
 720. Román, Manuel Antonio. Oradores sagrados chilenos. Introduction to *Oradores sagrados chilenos* [*Bibl. de Escritores de Chile. X.*]. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Barcelona, Año 1913. 8°. XXII + 1004 p.

The prologue gives a sketch of sacred oratory from 1810 to 1910 and the text contains selections.

721. ——— Discurso . . . *Bol. de la Acad. Chil.*, I. 325-37.

Biographical details and eulogy of E. Nercasseau Morán.

722. Salas Errázuriz, Juan R. *Carta al R. P. Víctor Maturana* . . . Santiago de Chile, Imp. de Enrique Blanchard-Chessi, 1905. 8°. 51 p.

The author denies that the *Diálogo de los porteros* (Vol. II. of the *Historia de los Agustinos en Chile*) is by Padre José Erazo, and attempts to prove that it was written by Manuel de Salas.

723. Salas Lavaqui, Manuel. Discurso de contestación . . . *Bol. de la Acad. Chil.*, I. 286-309.

Biographical details regarding J. Vicuña Cifuentes and a discussion of popular poetry in Chile.

724. ——— Discurso . . . leído en los funerales de Don Vicente Reyes. *Ibid.*, II. 167-8.

Biographical in character.

725. Sanfuentes, Salvador. Romanticismo. *Semanario de Sant.*, p. 12ff.

"Artículo que promovió viva polémica entre D. F. Sarmiento y otros escritores argentinos con la redacción del *Semanario*". L. I. Silva, *Rev. de Bibl.*, III, 307.

726. Santa María, Fernando. Don Salvador Sanfuentes. Published in *Suscripción de la Academia de Bellas Letras* . . .

727. Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino [Argentine]. *Obras. Publicadas bajo los auspicios del gobierno argentino. Tomo I. Artículos críticos i literarios (1841-1842)*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Gutenberg, 1885. 8°. XXXII + 365 p.

"Atendite et videte si est dolor, sicut dolor mens", p. 12-17. Published in *El Mercurio*, Mar. 3, 1841, criticising the newspapers of Santiago and Valparaíso for their sudden appearance and disappearance.

"El Colera Morbus en Santiago", p. 65-70. An article from *El Mercurio* of May 18, 1841, commenting on the short life of political newspapers in Chile.

"La publicación de libros en Chile", p. 70-2. From *El Mercurio*, June 10, 1841. Backwardness of the printing of books in Chile and the importance of their diffusion.

"Atraso del teatro en Santiago", p. 72-5. From *El Mercurio* of June 7, 1841.

"Canto al incendio de la Compañía, por A. Bello", p. 84-7. Favorable comment published in *El Mercurio* of July 15, 1841, expressing regret over the lack of interest in poetry in Chile.

"Primera polémica literaria", p. 208-47. Controversy (*El Mercurio*, Apr. 27, May 7, 19, and 22, June 3, 5, 22, 23, 25, and 30, 1842) over *Ejercicios populares de la lengua castellana* by Fernández de Herrera, in the course of which Sarmiento criticises the literary men of Chile.

"Segunda polémica literaria", p. 283-320. Published in *El Mercurio* of July 19, 25-31, and Aug. 7-8, 1842. The controversy with *El Seminario* of Santiago over romanticism. See *El Seminario* and S. Sanfuentes.

"Los amores del poeta, por Carlos Bello", p. 353-8. A critical analysis.

728. ——— *Obras . . . Tomo II. Artículos críticos i literarios (1842-1853)*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Gutenberg, 1885. 8°. 381 p.

"El teatro de Santiago á fines de 1842", p. 21-3. Published in *El Progreso*, Nov. 15, 1842.

"Contra Jotabeche", p. 56-63. Polemic with J. J. Vallejo, published in *El Progreso* Dec. 2, 10, 1842, and Jan. 4, 1843.

"Ernesto, drama de Rafael Minvielle", p. 107-13. Critical analysis of this drama published in *El Progreso* of Feb. 15, 1843.

"La Revista Católica", p. 135-40. From *El Progreso*, Mar. 10-11, 1843. Remarks on the prospectus issued by this magazine.

"La cartera, drama traducido por Rafael Minvielle", p. 160-4. Critical analysis published in *El Progreso*, Apr. 26, 1843.

"Los trabajos de Claudio Gay", p. 168-9. Published in *El Progreso*, July 22, 1843. The importance of Gay's works in the dissemination abroad of information about Chile.

"Historia física i política de Chile por Don Claudio Gay", p. 206-11. From *El Progreso* of Aug. 20, 1844. General remarks on the first few chapters of this work.

"La dictadura de O'Higgins", p. 363-9. An open letter published in *La Crónica*, Dec. 26, 1853, commenting favorably on this book and rectifying certain details of M. L. Amunátegui's account of the events leading up to the death of Carrera.

729. ——— *Obras . . . Tomo III. Defensa. Recuerdos de provincia. Necrolojías i biografías*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Gutenberg, 1885. 8°. Introduction by Luis Montt, VIII + 378 p.

"Don Manuel Salas", p. 218-20.

"Ensayo sobre la vida i escritos de don Manuel J. Gandarillas", p. 230-9.

"D. José Miguel Infante", p. 246-7.

730. *Semanario (El)*. L. I. Silva A. in his "Estudios bibliográficos sobre la literatura chilena", published in the *Revista de bibliografía chilena* . . . III. 303-12, cites and comments as follows upon certain critical articles published in this magazine.

"Literatura", p. 4. Acerca del movimiento literario operado en esa época.

"Por mi parte á la *Gaceta*", p. 16. Respuesta del autor de la poesía *Un suspiro y una flor*, al articulista de la *Gaceta del Comercio* que la critica.

"Polvos antibiliosos y purgativos para *El Mercurio* de Valparaíso", p. 23. Polémica con Sarmiento acerca del artículo 'Romanticismo'."

"Una advertencia á la *Gaceta*", p. 32. Polémica sobre lo mismo.

"El *Semanario*", p. 32. Polémica con *El Mercurio*.

"Producciones dramáticas modernas", p. 47.

"Los amores del poeta, de Carlos Bello", p. 62. ¿Por García del Río?

"Certamen literario. Informe de la comisión . . .", p. 86 and 93. Salieron favorecidos con el premio: Santiago Lindsay, Ramón Ovalle, Francisco Bilbao, Javier Rengifo y Juan Bello . . .

"Primera representación de *Ernesto*, de Rafael Minvielle", p. 127.

"Las novelas en el día", p. 185.

"Sociedad Literaria en Santiago", p. 225. Da cuenta de la formación de esta nueva sociedad literaria por varios jóvenes que siguen la carrera del foro; constituirá su principal objeto el ejercicio de la composición y el estudio filosófico de la historia.

731. Silva A., Luis Ignacio. *La novela en Chile*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. y Enc. Barcelona, 1910. 8°. 523 p.

A bibliography of Chilean prose fiction with frequent notes containing literary criticism, synopses of plots, discussion of characters, etc. These articles are usually quotations from magazines and include the name of the author but unfortunately no reference to the magazine. The most extensive deal with the following books: D. Barros Grez, *El Huérfano*; A. Blest Gana, *Los transplantados*; T. Gatica Martínez, *Gran Mundo*; A. Givovich, *El rigor de la corneta*; V. Grez, *Marianita*; *Id.*, *El ideal de una esposa*; J. Mackenna y Eyzaguirre, *Páginas americanas*; E. Montt, *Mujer y ángel*; Borja Orijuela Grez, *El cura civil*; L. Orrego Luco, *Episodios nacionales de la Guerra de la Independencia de Chile, Memorias de un voluntario de la patria vieja*; B. Pinto, *La virgen del cementerio ó misterios de una noche*; E. Rodríguez Mendoza, *Última esperanza*; A. Silva de la Fuente, *Ventura*; *Id.*, *Penas que matan*; E. del Solar, *Las hadas del Andalién*; A. del Solar, *Contra la marea*; A. Valderrama, *María*; M. Vargas, *Un drama íntimo*.

732. S[ilva] C[otapos], C[arlos]. *Historia del desarrollo intelectual de Chile*, por A. Fuenzalida. *Rev. (S) Cat.*, V. 498ff; X. 824ff. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
733. ——— *Historia de los Agustinos de Chile*, por Víctor Maturana. *Ibid.*, VII. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
734. ——— *El Dr. Rodolfo A. Philippi*, por D. Barros Arana. *Ibid.*, VIII. 339ff. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
735. ——— Barros Arana, *Un decenio de la historia de Chile*. *Ibid.*, IX. 530ff; and X. 735 ff. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
736. ——— La reforma de los Agustinos y el Rmo. Arzobispo Valdivieso. *Ibid.*, XVII. 32-9, 124-33, 191-99, 268-75, 332-37.

Deals with criticisms made by Maturana in his *Historia de los Agustinos*.

737. ——— Última palabra al R. P. Fr. Víctor Maturana. *Ibid.*, XVII. 505-14.

738. ——— *Barros Arana historiador*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. de San José, 1913. Pamphlet of 23 p.

Reprint of an article published in the *Rev. (3) Cat.*, XXV. 704-24.

"Crítica acerba de la obra histórica de Barros Arana. Es un mal estilista, su concepción de la historia fué de lo mas elemental y objetivo, carecía de toda idea filosófica, toda su obra está animada de marcado espíritu anti-religioso. Apenas si las condiciones de investigador de Barros Arana encuentran alguna gracia en el crítico". *Rev. de H. y G.*, VIII. p. 475.

739. ——— *Pedro Villagra*, por Crescente Errázuriz. *Rev. (3) Cat.*, No. 375, Mar. 17, 1917. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]
 740. ——— Monseñor José Ignacio Eizaguirre Portales. *Anal. de la Univ.*, 1918, Second Semes. 303-84.
 ——— *Monseñor . . .* Santiago de Chile, Soc. Imp. Lit. Barcelona, 1919. 8°. 85 p.

A biography of Eizaguirre with a great many facts and a minimum of eulogy, personal comment or vague generalizations.

741. Silva Lezaeta, Luis. *La historia de Chile durante los gobiernos de García Ramón, Merlo de la Fuente y Jaraquemada*, por Crescente Errázuriz. *Rev. (3) Cat.*, XVII. 612-18, 683-93, 764-75, 835-47.
 742. Silva Vildósola, Carlos. *Expansiones*, poesías por Luis Barros Méndez. *Rev. (2) Cat.*, III. 46-9.
 743. ——— *Periodismo y letras en Chile. Conferencia leída en el Ateneo Científico, Literario y Artístico de Madrid, el 14 de Febrero de 1914*. Santiago, [No press given], 1914. 25 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*].
 744. Smith, Jorje. Á propósito de la *Miscelánea literaria, política i religiosa* por Zorababel Rodríguez. *Est. de Ch.*, VII. 129-31.
 745. ——— Ligeras observaciones relativas al lenguaje i a la literatura de Chile. *Ibid.*, VII. 677-80.
 746. ——— *El precio de la gloria*. Drama en un acto i en verso por M. Antonio Benavides. *Ibid.*, VIII. 800-5, 880-8, 908-16.
 747. Sofia, José Antonio. *Las mujeres de la independencia*, por Vicente Grez. *Los Tiempos*, Dec. 22, 1878.
 748. Solar, Enrique. Introducción á *Las poesías de don Carlos Walker Martínez*. Santiago, Imp. del Correo, Nov. de 1868. 4°. X + 223 p. Also published in *Est. de Ch.*, II. 84-7.

A biographical sketch.

749. ——— Poesías de Martín José Lira. *Est. de Ch.*, II. 257-9.
 750. ——— *Romances americanos*, por Carlos Walker Martínez. *Ibid.*, IV. 791-4.
 751. ——— *Leonor ó el último día de los Jesuitas*, drama histórico en cinco actos, por Ángel C. Vicuña. *Ibid.*, IV. 510-13.
 752. ——— *Evanjelina*, romance de la Arcadia traducido del inglés de Enrique W. Longfellow por Carlos Morla Vicuña. *Ibid.*, V. 241-4.
 753. ——— Para la historia. *La legación de Chile en el Perú desde Abril hasta Setiembre de 1864, i el conflicto peruano-español*, por J. N. Hurtado. *Ibid.*, V. 649-52.

754. ———— *La voz del corazón*, drama . . . por M. A. Benavides. *Ibid.*, VI. 49-51.
755. ———— *Un drama íntimo*. Novela oriĝinal de Moisés Vargas. *Ibid.*, VI. 115-16.
756. ———— *Recuerdos de treinta años*, por José Zapiola. *Ibid.*, VI. 215-17.
757. ———— *El proscrito*, leyenda por C. Walker Martínez. *Ibid.*, VI. 747-8.
758. ———— *Poesías líricas* de J. A. Soffia. *Ibid.*, X. 841-6.
759. Solar, Fidelis P. del. *Eduardo de la Barra íntimo. Reminiscencias de su juventud*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. i Enc. El Globo, MCMI. 8°. 38 p. + Erratas. Two ports.

A few pages only are devoted to reminiscence and biography. The rest of the pamphlet contains poems not found in collections of E. de la Barra's verse.

760. Suárez, José Bernardo. *Rasgos biográficos de hombres notables de Chile. Obra aprobada por la Facultad de Humanidades i el Consejo de la Universidad para texto de lectura en los colegios i escuelas de la República*. Santiago de Chile, Imp. Nacional, Octubre de 1863. 8°. 289 p.
761. ———— *Plutarco de las jóvenes. Rasgos biográficos de mujeres célebres de Europa i América . . . para el uso de las jóvenes sud-americanas*. Santiago, Imp. Chilena, 1871. 8°. 343 p.

Includes brief biographies of Mercedes Marín del Solar, Rosario Orrego de Uribe and Quinteria Varas Marín.

762. *Suscripción de la Academia de Bellas Letras a la estatua de Don Andrés Bello*. Santiago, Imp. de la Lib. del Mercurio, 1874. 4°. VIII + 375 p. + Ind., (2).

"D. Andrés Bello", by M. L. Amunátegui, p. 9-33. From Amunátegui's *Biografías de americanos*.

"La última enfermedad de Bello", by A. Murillo, p. 35-6.

"Poesías de D. Andrés Bello (Estudio)" by D. Arteaga Alemparte, p. 37-52.

"Filosofía de Bello", by Ángel C. Gallo, p. 63-9.

"La erudición de Bello", by D. Barros Arana, p. 71-4.

"Recuerdos del maestro", by J. V. Lastarria, p. 75-92.

"Amigos i discípulos de Bello. Mariano Egaña", by Luis Montt, p. 95-101.

"Amigos . . . José J. Vallejo", by Pedro L. Gallo, p. 103-13.

"Amigos . . . F. de Paulo Matta", by D. Arteaga Alemparte, p. 123-9.

"Amigos . . . Don Salvador Sanfuentes", by Fernando Santa María, p. 131-4.

"Amigos . . . Juan Bello", by D. Arteaga Alemparte, p. 135-9.

"Amigos . . . Manuel Antonio Tocornal i Grez", by M. L. Amunátegui, p. 140-56.

"Idea sobre nuestra literatura histórica (Influencia de Bello). Memoria leída por el Rector de la Universidad de Chile en el aniversario solemne de 29 de octubre de 1848", p. 273-89. After a discussion in general terms of Bello's influence on the writing of history in Chile, mention is made of the various *Memorias* inspired by him.

763. Thayer Ojeda, Tomás. Cristóbal de Molina. *Rev. Chil. de H. y G.*, V. 112-6.
764. ———— Cristóbal de Molina. Una rectificación. *Ibid.*, VII. 89-90.
765. ———— Los héroes indígenas de *La Araucana*. *Ibid.*, XV. 306-64.
766. ———— Ensayo crítico sobre algunas obras históricas utilizables para el estudio de la conquista de Chile. *Anal. de la Univ.*, CXXXIV. 341-87, 655-75; CXL. 173-208, 419-46, CXLIII. 163-98, 673-724; CXLIV. 3-70; CXLV. 545-77; CXLVI. 789-838.

767. ——— El Arauco Domado del licenciado Pedro de Oña. *Ibid.*, CXLVI. 601-55.

768. Tondreau, Narciso. *Á la memoria de don Jorge Huneeus [y Zegers], eminente estadista, publicista i profesor. Corona fúnebre publicada en el primer aniversario de su muerte acaecida el 21 de mayo de 1889.* Santiago de Chile, Imp. Cervantes, 1890. 8°. 257 p. Port.

This volume contains a very considerable amount of biographical and critical information. Among the numerous articles are a biography by Enrique C. Latorre (p. 91-4), one by N. Tondreau (p. 117-24) and a critical article by Enrique Montt dealing with *La Constitución ante el Congreso*.

769. Toro, Gaspar. *Los precursores de la independencia de Chile*, por M. L. Amunátegui. *Rev. (2) de Sant.*, I. 107-20, 195-208.

770. "T. Q." *La vida que pasa*, cuentos por L. Orrego Luco. *Juventud* I. No. 3, 109-11.

771. Torres Arce, J. M. La poesía en Chile. *Rev. (1) Chil.*, XII. 241-59.

772. Torres, José Antonio. *Oradores chilenos. Retratos parlamentarios.* Santiago de Chile, Imp. de la Opinión, 1860. 8°. VI + 189 p.

With little biographical detail this volume sets forth the oratorical qualities, character of the speeches, political stand, etc. of the following men: Mariano Egafía, Joaquín Campino, Manuel Montt, Antonio Varas, Manuel Antonio Tocornal, Antonio García Reyes, José Victorino Lastarria, Salvador Sanfuentes, Pedro Palazuelos, Juan Bello, Fernando Urzár Gárfias, Alejandro Reyes, Francisco Bilbao, Domingo Santa María, Manuel Antonio Matta, Francisco de Paula Taforó, Marcial González, Francisco Marín, Federico Errázuriz, Álvaro Covarrubias, Ángel Custodia Gallo, Eugenio Vergara, Santiago Prado, and Guillermo Matta.

The article dealing with S. Sanfuentes was published in the *Rev. del Pacíf.*, III. 35-40; and that about M. A. Tocornal. *Ibid.*, III. 112-24.

773. Urzúa, Miguel Rafael. Lacunza y su obra. *Rev. (3) Cat.*, Apr. 3 and 18, 1915. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]

774. ——— Respuesta al señor Pbo. don Olegario Lazo por su artículo . . . publicado en la *Revista Católica*. *Ibid.*, June 19, 1915. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]

775. ——— D. José Santiago Rodríguez Zorilla, 1752-1832. *Obra escrita por el Señor . . . Carlos Silva Cotapos. Estudio crítico . . .* Santiago de Chile, Imp. El Globo, Año de 1916. 16°. 48 p.

776. ——— *Las doctrinas del P. Manuel Lacunza contenidas en su obra "La Venida del Mesías en Gloria y Majestad"*. Santiago, Imp. Universo, 1917. 145 X 90 mm. 565 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]

777. ——— *El Pbro. Emilio Vaisse y el Lacunzismo. (Publicación . . . en defensa del P. Lacunza)*. Santiago, Imp. El Progreso, 1917. 145 X 90 mm. 135 p. [*Rev. de Bibl.*]

778. Urzúa, Teodoro. *Bocetos y siluetas. Los conservadores de Chile. Apuntes biográficos.* Santiago, Imp. Victoria, 1886. 4°. 150 p.

Sketches frequently wanting in facts but never in eulogy. Of them the most complete are the biographies of literary men, especially Abdón Cifuentes, Carlos Walker Martínez, Zorababel Rodríguez, and Ventura Blanco Viel.

779. Vaisse, Emilio ("Omer Emeth"). *La vida literaria en Chile*. Primera serie, 1908-9. Santiago de Chile, Imp. y Enc. La Ilustración, 1909. 8°. VIII + 422 p.

A series of critical articles first published in *El Mercurio* of Santiago.

Poetry. Allán Samadhy, *Horas perdidas*; Pedro Prado, *Flores de cardo*; Ernesto A. Guzmán, *Vida interna*; Ismael Parraguez, *Poesías infantiles*; Gustavo Mora Pinochet, *Melancolías*; Juan

A. Chesebrough, *Prosas rimadas*; Blanca Vanini Silva, *Oda á Italia*; J. M. Rodríguez, *Páginas sentimentales*; E. Valenzuela Oliveros, *Infantiles*; Samuel A. Lillo, *Canciones de Arauco*; Ignacio Pérez Kallens ("Leonardo Penna"), *Yo and Biblia profana*; Mariana Cox Stiven ("Shade"), *Remordimiento*.

Novels, short stories and drama. Luis Orrego Luco, *Casa grande*; T. Gatica Martínez, *El gran mundo*; "Casa grande, Gran mundo y la crítica"; G. Silva, *El Doctor Leroy*; R. Maluenda, *Cuentos chilenos*; F. Santiván, *Palpitaciones de vida*; Ángel Pino, *Páginas chilenas*; M. J. Ortis, *Cartas de la aldea*; T. Vargas y Vargas, *Expiación*.

History. "José Toribio Medina, sus obras"; Crescente Errázuriz, *Historia de Chile durante los gobiernos de García Ramón, Merlo de la Fuente y Jaraquemada*; L. Galdames, *Estudio de la historia de Chile*; Luis Silva Lezaeta, *El conquistador Francisco de Aguirre*; D. Amunátegui Solar, *Las encomiendas de indígenas en Chile*; E. Poirier, *Chile en 1908*; H. R. Guíñast, *Los Frailes en Chile*.

Scientific philosophy and sociology. "J. E. Lagarrigue, su obra"; Enrique Molina, *Un pensador norte-americano*, Lester F. Ward; B. Vicuña Subercaseaux, *El socialismo revolucionario*; J. Saavedra, *Repeliendo la invasión*; T. Pinochet Le-Brun, *La conquista de Chile en el siglo XX*; V. Brandau, *Caracteres mentales de la mujer*, *Criminal represivo*; "Una controversia, El Darwinismo".

Criticism and philology. M. A. Román, *Diccionario de chilenismos. Tomo I*; E. Astorquiza, *La literatura francesa en Chile*; Amanda Labarca Hubertson, *Impresiones de juventud*; "Imitadores y plagiarios".

Three masters. José E. Rodó, *Motivos de Proteo*; E. Gómez Carillo, *Grecia*; "Anatole France, á propósito de sus conferencias en Buenos Aires".

The following critical articles appeared in *El Mercurio* of Santiago unless otherwise stated.

ANTHOLOGIES

- 780. — Los juegos florales del centenario. Valparaíso, 1910. Jan. 30, 1911.
- 781. — Los juegos florales de Valparaíso. Segundo certamen patrocinado por la prensa. Oct. 23, 1911.
- 782. — El libro de los juegos florales en Santiago, 22 de diciembre de 1914. Oct. 18, 1915.
- 783. — *Pequeña antología de poetas chilenos contemporáneos. Introducción de Armando Donoso.* Apr. 9, 1917.
- 784. — Julio Molina Núñez y J. Agustín Araya, *Selva lírica* . . . May 28, 1917.
- 785. — El libro de los juegos florales cervantistas y otras fiestas organizadas por la colonia española en 1916. Compilación y reseñas por Pelayo de Tapia. May 14, 1917.
- 786. — Fiesta de la Raza, 1492-1916. Juegos florales organizados por la colonia española de Concepción. July 16, 1917.

POETRY

- 787. — Carlos R. Mondaca, *Por los caminos. La Semana*, Nov. 20, 1910.
- 788. — Manuel Magallanes Moure, *La jornada*; Gustavo Mora, *De mi vergel*; Fernando López Loayza, *Idealidades artísticas*; E. Medina, *Oda con motivo del centenario. Ibid.*, Jan. 9, 1911.
- 789. — Tomás de la Barra, *Las primeras hojas. Ibid.*, Jan. 16, 1911, and *El Mercurio*, Jan. 30, 1911.
- 790. — Ismael Parraguez, *Flora exótica. Jan. 30, 1911.*

791. ———— *Oda con motivo del centenario de la Independencia* (E. Medina) Jan. 30, 1911.
792. ———— Guillermo Arroyo A., *El cóndor de los Andes. Primera parte de las narraciones patrióticas*. Feb. 27, 1911.
793. ———— Samuel A. Lillo, *Chile heroico*. Mar. 20, 1911.
794. ———— Santiago Fernández Vázquez, *Cantos de mi tierra*. June 19, 1911.
795. ———— Alfredo Guillermo Bravo, *El jardín de mis ensueños*; Efraín Vázquez Jara, *Versos*. June 19, 1911.
796. ———— Samuel Fernández Montalva, *Golondrina*; Samuel A. Lillo, *La Concepción*. July 17, 1911.
797. ———— Daniel de la Vega, *Al calor del terruño*. July 31, 1911.
798. ———— Francisco Contreras, *La piedad sentimental*. Sept. 11, 1911.
799. ———— Ambrosio Montt y Montt, *Los polvos del camino*; Roberto M. Miranda, *Sombras*. Dec. 4, 1911.
800. ———— Ricardo Ahumada Maturana, *La vida*. Dec. 11, 1911.
801. ———— Jorge González Bastias, *Misas de primavera*. Jan. 15, 1912.
802. ———— Vicente García Huidobro, *Ecos del alma*; Antonio Orrego Barros, *La nave vieja—Epopeya del combate de Iquique*. May 20, 1912.
803. ———— Julio Molina Núñez, *Hojas secas*. July 8, 1912.
804. ———— Samuel A. Lillo, *La escolta de la bandera*; Deyanira Urzúa de Calvo, *Patria y hogar—Poetas y dramas*. July 15, 1912.
805. ———— Carlos Pezoa Véliz, *Alma chilena*. . . . June 17, 1912.
806. ———— Blanca Vanini Silva, *Otros sonos de mi lira*. Aug. 19, 1912.
807. ———— Ciriaco Barrios ("Gil Guero"), *Recuerdos*. Aug. 26, 1912.
808. ———— Víctor Barros Lynch, *Ofrenda lírica*. Sept. 16, 1912.
809. ———— Manuel Magallanes Moure, *La jornada. Segunda edición*. Nov. 4, 1912.
810. ———— Francisco Contreras, *Luna de mi patria y otros poemas*. Jan. 20, 1913.
811. ———— Darío Cavada, *Florescencia*. Mar. 17, 1913.
812. ———— Hector Arnaldo Guerra, *Poetas líricos*. Mar. 24, 1913.
813. ———— A. Rojas Molina, *Las flores de mi huerto*; Benjamín Oviedo Martínez, *Ingenuas*. Apr. 7, 1913.
814. ———— Samuel A. Lillo, *Canto á la América Latina. Primer premio en los juegos florales de Tucumán*. Apr. 21, 1913.
815. ———— Pedro Prado, *El llamado del mundo*. May 26, 1913.
816. ———— Benjamín Oviedo Martínez, *La voz de la naturaleza*. July 21, 1913.
817. ———— J. N. Durán, *Las flores del bien y del mal*. Aug. 11, 1913.
818. ———— Juan Rojas Segovia, *El alma prisionera. Poemas en prosa y novela*. Nov. 3, 1913.
819. ———— Eduardo Castillo U., *Flores silvestres*. Dec. 15, 1913.
820. ———— Ricardo Ahumada M., *Soy abuelo*; Oscar Alfonso Godoy, *Amores puros*. Jan. 26, 1914.
821. ———— Carlos Barella, *Campanas silenciosas*. Mar. 2, 1914.
822. ———— Max Jara, *¿Poesía?* Apr. 27, 1914.
823. ———— Clemente Barahona Vega, *Canto á Pratt*. May 18, 1914.
824. ———— Benjamín Oviedo Martínez, *Lo triste es así*. June 15, 1914.
825. ———— Samuel A. Lillo, *Á Vasco Núñez de Balboa*. Oct. 19, 1914.

826. ——— Julio Munizaga Ossandón, *Las rutas ilusorias*. Dec. 14, 1914.
827. ——— J. Lagos Lisboa, *Yo iba solo*. May 15, 1915.
828. ——— Pedro Prado, *Los pájaros errantes*. May 31, 1915.
829. ——— Mardoquero Pantoja, *La voz del silencio*. June 14, 1915.
830. ——— David Rubio, *Remanso*. June 28, 1915.
831. ——— J. Peláez y Tapia, *Jardín interior y otros poemas*. Sept. 20, 1915.
832. ——— J. Kloques Campos, *En serio y en broma*; Rodríguez Pallada, *Hacia la cumbre*; David Enrique Perry, *Témpanos errantes*. Oct. 25, 1915.
833. ——— Ismael Parraguez, *Urbe*. Jan. 3, 1916.
834. ——— Raimundo Morales, *Ensayos poéticos*. May 1, 1916.
835. ——— Emiliano Corbolán Melgarejo, *Al caer de la tarde*. July 24, 1916.
836. ——— Antonio Pávez, Roberto Lagos, and Raimundo Morales; *Ensayos poéticos*. Aug. 28, 1916.
837. ——— Marcos Brito, *Las plumas de mi nido*; Rafael Coronel, *Por los campos de Montiel*. Sept. 4, 1916.
838. ——— Desiderio Lizana, *Sancho en el cielo*. Obra premiada en los juegos florales de Valparaíso, organizados por la colonia española en homenaje al tercer centenario de Cervantes. Sept. 25, 1916.
839. ——— Javier Vial Solar, *El caballero de la gloria*. Dec. 17, 1916.
840. ——— Juana Inés de la Cruz, *Horas de sol*, Con prólogo de Manuel Magallanes Moure. Dec. 27, 1916.
841. ——— Luis Ortúzar González ("Tristán Montoya"), *Toronjil y yerba mota*. 9 versos. Feb. 19, 1917.
842. ——— Pedro Antonio González, *Poestas*. Edición . . . con introducción y notas por Armando Donoso. Oct. 8, 1917.
843. ——— Pedro de Oña, *Arauco domado*. Edición crítica de la Academia Chilena . . . anotado por don José Toribio Medina. Nov. 19, 1917.
844. ——— Carlos Acuña, *Vaso de arcilla*. Nov. 26, 1917.
845. ——— Vicente Huidobro, *Automne*. Del libro titulado *Horizons Carrés*. En selva lírica. May 6, 1918.
846. ——— Benjamín Velasco Reyes, *El alma de los sonetos*; Francisco Donoso, *Lírica*. May 27, 1918.
847. ——— Antonio Bórquez Solar, *Laudatorias heroicas*. Aug. 5, 1918.
848. ——— Daniel de la Vega, *Los momentos*; Domingo Contreras Gómez, *Efímeras*. Aug. 12, 1918.
849. ——— Víctor Domingo Silva, *Las mejores poesías*. Sept. 2, 1918.
850. ——— Benjamín Oviedo Martínez, *Inquietud*. Sept. 9, 1918.
851. ——— Luis Felipe Contardo, *Cantos del camino*. Prólogo de F. A. Concha Castillo. Nov. 25 and Dec. 2, 1918.

DRAMATIC WORKS

852. ——— Arturo Ossandón de la Pena, *Excelsior*. Drama lírico-fantástico. *La Semana*, Dec. 26, 1910.
853. ——— María del Pilar Montesinos, *Homenaje á la patria*. Cuadro lírico-dramático dedicado al ejército. *Ibid.*, Dec. 26, 1910.
854. ——— Samuel Fernández Montalva, *Calígula*, drama en cinco actos. Feb. 5, 1911.

855. ——— Antonio Orrego Barros, *La Marejá*. Feb. 21, 1911.
 856. ——— Carlos Mondaca and Max Jara, *Durante la reconquista*. Mar. 5, 1911.
 857. ——— Leonardo Pena, *Las puertas*. *Tetralogía dramática*. Oct. 14, 1912.
 858. ——— Manuel Magallanes Moure, *La batalla*. Oct. 21, 1912.
 859. ——— Aurelio Díaz Meza, *Bajo la selva*. Jan. 12, 1914.
 860. ——— Miguel Rafael Urzúa, *Prat*. Apr. 13, 1914.
 861. ——— Aurelio Díaz Meza, *Damas de moda (Divorçons)*. *Opereta* . . . Apr. 20, 1914.
 862. ——— Carlos Morla Lynch, *Teatro. Tomo I. La senda. El príncipe de las perlas azules. La ciega*. July 5, 1915.
 863. ——— Antonio Orrego Barros, *El capitán trovador. Poema dramático en cuatro actos que trata sobre la vida de . . . Ercilla*. Dec. 20, 1915.

NOVELS

864. ——— Joaquín Edwards Bello, *El inútil*; Senén Palacios, *El hogar chileno*; Fernando Santiván, *El ansia. La Semana*, Dec. 12, 1910.
 865. ——— Confesiones y libelos. Á propósito de *El inútil* de Joaquín Edwards Bello. *Ibid.*, Jan. 2, 1911.
 866. ——— Iris (Inés Echeverría de Larraín), *Sus obras. Tierra virgen, Perfiles vagos, Emociones teatrales, Hojas caídas* [4 vols. 1910]. Mar. 27, 1911.

Cf. Aclaración sobre este artículo. Apr. 3, 1911.

867. ——— Luis Rodríguez Gamboa, *Los sueños se disipan*. Apr. 3, 1911.
 868. ——— Tancredo Pinochet Le-Brun, *La Obra*. Apr. 10, 1911.
 869. ——— Guillermo Labarca Hubertson, *Mirando el océano. Diario de un conscripto*. Apr. 17, 1911.
 870. ——— Sinforoso Ugarte Alcayaga, *La plegaria de un ángel*. May 29, 1911.
 871. ——— Nataniel Yáñez Silva, *Ocaso. Novela premiada en el concurso literario del centenario*. June 12, 1911.
 872. ——— Luis Roberto Boza, *El cilicio*. July 24, 1911.
 873. ——— Carlos Lamarca Bello, *La conquista de la dicha*. Oct. 9, 1911.
 874. ——— Adolfo Quirós, *Nunca*. Nov. 6, 1911.
 875. ——— Tancredo Pinochet Le-Brun, *Nieves eternas*. Nov. 13, 1911.
 876. ——— R. Hurtado Borne, *Á través de los besos y de las almas*. Jan. 8, 1912.
 877. ——— Carlos Lamarca Bello, *Los horizontes del bien*. Jan. 15, 1912.
 878. ——— Julián Doble, *Sherlock Holmes en Santiago, ó sea la muerte misteriosa de José Marini*. Mar. 4, 1912.
 879. ——— Luis Jirón, *Ecos de la selva. Laura*. Mar. 18, 1912.
 880. ——— José Antonio Olivares, *Alma chilena*. June 24, 1912.
 881. ——— Rafael Maluenda, *La edad peligrosa. Traducción. Prólogo de Misael Correa*. Apr. 29, 1912.
 882. ——— Joaquín Edwards Bello, *El monstruo*. May 13, 1912.
 883. ——— René Hurtado Borne, *La jornada de la dicha*. Aug. 5, 1912.
 884. ——— Luis Orrego Luco, *En familia. Recuerdos del tiempo viejo*. Aug. 5, 1912.
 885. ——— Jorge Cuevas, *El amigo Jacques*. Oct. 21, 1912.

886. ——— Armando Carillo Ruedas, *Bendito sea el fruto*. Dec. 16, 1912.
887. ——— Víctor Domingo Silva, *Golondrina de invierno*. Dec. 30, 1912.
888. ——— Juan Cagliostro, *Neurótico en decomposición* (*Actualidades mundiales*). May 19, 1913.
889. ——— Fernando Santiván, *El crisol*. July 14, 1913.
890. ——— Tomás Gatica Martínez, *La cachetona*. Aug. 18, 1913.
891. ——— Juan Barros, *El zapato chino*. Oct. 17, 1913.
892. ——— Luis Orrego Luco, *Un idilio nuevo*. Nov. 24, 1913.
893. ——— Manuel J. Ortiz, *El maestro*. Mar. 9, 1914.
894. ——— Honorio Henríquez Pérez, *Por senderos del amor*. Mar. 16, 1914.
895. ——— Januario Espinosa, *La vida humilde*. Primer premio en el certamen de 1913. Apr. 20, 1914.
896. ——— Antonio Bórquez Solar, *La belleza del demonio: La Quintrala . . . premiada por el Consejo Superior de Letras y Música de Chile*. May 25, 1914.
897. ——— Inés Echeverría de Larraín, *Entre deux mondes*. Novela en francés. Sept. 21, 1914.
898. ——— Luis Orrego Luco, *Al través de la tempestad*. *Recuerdo del tiempo viejo. La revolución de 1891*. Nov. 23, 1914.
899. ——— Pedro Prado, *La reina de Rapa Nui*. Nov. 30, 1914.
900. ——— Sady Zañartu, *Desde el vivac*. *Vida y decires de un soldado de buen humor*. Apr. 5, 1915.
901. ——— Eduardo Barrios, *El niño que enloqueció de amor*. ¡Pobre feo! *Papá y Mamá*. Apr. 19, 1915.
902. ——— Ismael Parraguez, *La araña*. Jan. 3, 1916.
903. ——— Januario Espinosa, *Las inquietudes de Ave María*. May 29, 1916.
904. ——— Elvira Santa Cruz Ossa ("Roxane"), *Flor silvestre*. July 31, 1916.
905. ——— Rafael Maluenda, *Venidos á menos*. Oct. 23, 1916.
906. ——— Fernando Santiván, *La hechizada*. Dec. 11, 1916.
907. ——— Ismael Parraguez, *Esperanza*. Novela pintoresca y trágica de las escuelas de Chile. Jan. 8, 1917.

Cf. A propósito de la novela *Esperanza*. Carta de I. Parraguez pidiendo una rectificación. Jan. 15, 1917.

908. ——— Vera Zouroff, *Martha*. Novela nacional. Apr. 16, 1917.
909. ——— Emilio Rodríguez Mendoza, *Santa Colonia*. Sept. 10, 1917.
910. ——— Armando Moock, *Pobrecitas*. *Memorias de un gato romántico*. Dec. 24, 1917.
911. ——— "Delie Rouge", *Helena*. Apr. 15, 1918.
912. ——— Eduardo Barrios, *Un perdido*. June 3, 1918.
913. ——— Joaquín Edwards Bello, *La cuna de Esmeraldo*. *Observaciones y orientaciones americanas: Preludio de una novela chilena*. July 22, 1918.
914. ——— Luis Orrego Luco, *La vida que pasa*. Dec. 30, 1918.

SHORT STORIES

915. ——— El primer certamen literario del *Mercurio*. Oct. 2, 9, 16, 20 and 25, 1911.
916. ——— Juan García, *Episodios nacionales*. Mauricio; Wilfreda Buxton, *Viditas*. Dec. 18, 1911.

917. ——— Jilaberto Pivonca, *Los humildes. Instantáneas á través de la Metrópolis*. Apr. 1, 1912.
918. ——— Joaquín Edwards Bello, *La tragedia del Titanic*. May 6, 1912.
919. ——— Arturo Lamarca Bello, *Recordando*. Sept. 23, 1912.
920. ——— Roberto Alarcón Lobos, *Gente alegre*. Oct. 7, 1912.
921. ——— Joaquín Edwards Bello, *Cuentos de todos colores*. Oct. 12, 1912.
922. ——— Meditando sobre las próximas vacaciones. Á propósito de *La casa abandonada, parábolas y pequeños ensayos* por Pedro Prado. *Familia*, Nov. 1912.
923. ——— Mariano Latorre, *Cuentos del Maule. Tipos y paisajes chilenos*. Dec. 23, 1912.
924. ——— Carlos Acuña, *Á flor de tierra. Cuentos y poesías*. Sept. 8, 1913.
925. ——— Carlos Silva Vildósola, *En la nieve*. Sept. 15, 1913.
926. ——— Alfonso Casanova Vicuña, *De la realidad y del ensueño*. Dec. 1, 1913.
927. ——— Carlos Iñiguez Larraín, *Los jóvenes blancos*. Dec. 8, 1913.
928. ——— Rafael Maluenda, *Los ciegos*. Jan 5, 1914.
929. ——— Manuel Magallanes Moure, *¿Qué es amor?* June 15, 1914.
930. ——— Pedro Prado, *Los Diez. El claustro. La barca*. Nov. 29, 1915.
931. ——— Egidio Poblete, *Cuentos del domingo. Lecturas para grandes y para chicos*. June 12, 1916.
932. ——— Clarisa Polanco de Hoffman ("Clary"). *Cuentos á Iris*. Aug. 21, 1916.
933. ——— Federico Gana, *Días de campo*. Jan. 22, 1917.
934. ——— Baldomero Lillo, *Sub Terra. Cuadros mineros. Introducción de Armando Donoso*. Apr. 23, 1917.
935. ——— Mariano Latorre, *Cuna de cóndores*. Oct. 7, 1917.

NOTES

ITEMS IN COMMERCE REPORTS, MAY AND JUNE, 1922

- Activities of Curaçao Petroleum Company. No. 22, May 29.
Activities of oil companies in Columbia. No. 25, June 19.
Alcohol-burning tractor in Brazil. No. 23, June 5.
American cars meet competition in Trinidad. No. 19, May 8.
American rice dominates Chilean market. No. 18, May 1.
American tires preferred in Salvador. *Id.*
Amount and prices of Ecuadorean exports. *Id.*
Appeal from recent Argentine ruling on bills of lading. No. 24, June 12.
Application of labor clauses of Mexican constitution. No. 25, June 19.
Appointment of agents for Latin America. No. 21, May 22.
Argentine economic notes. No. 20, May 15.
Argentine export duties for May. No. 19, May 8.
Id. for June. No. 24, June 12.
Argentine government acquires railway. No. 19, May 8.
The Argentine hide situation. No. 20, May 15.
Argentine import trade in 1920. No. 24, June 12.
Argentine market for lithographed material. *Id.*
Argentine mica mines for sale. No. 26, June 26.
Argentine petroleum activities. No. 24, June 12.
Argentine postal savings in flourishing condition. No. 21, May 22.
Argentine ruling on bills of lading. No. 22, May 29.
Banking developments in Cuba. No. 19, May 8.
The Barbados market for rubber sundries. *Id.*
Brazilian foreign trade since 1850. No. 25, June 19.
Brazilian importation of motor cars in 1921. No. 18, May 1.
Brazilian imports of paper. No. 24, June 12.
Brazilian market for paper bags. No. 21, May 22.
Brazilian markets for caustic soda. *Id.*
Brazilian notes. No. 22, May 29.
Brazilian rubber-tire factory. No. 25, June 19.
Business conditions at Tarapaca, Chile. *Id.*
Business conditions in Chihuahua. No. 18, May 1.
Censorship of motion pictures in Honduras. No. 21, May 22.

- Chilean cotton goods and clothing market. No. 25, June 19.
Chilean index of commodity prices. *Id.*
Chilean industrial exposition. No. 26, June 26.
Chilean nitrate prices lowered. No. 23, June 5.
Chilean production of iodine. No. 20, May 15.
Chilean shipping notes. No. 18, May 1.
Classification of Argentine hides and skins. *Id.*
Closing of Mexican guayule-rubber factory. No. 23, June 5.
Clubhouse to be built in Colon. No. 24, June 12.
Coal consumption in Cienfuegos consular district. No. 21, May 22.
Id. in Rosario. No. 25, June 19.
Id. in Uruguay. No. 18, May 1.
Coal deposits of Venezuela. No. 19, May 8.
Coal imports at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Nos. 22 and 26, May 29 and June 26.
Colombian prospects good. No. 23, June 5.
Commercial situation shows improvement in Brazil. No. 18, May 1.
Competition in the Argentine hardware market. No. 25, June 19.
Conditions affecting Cuban cane grinding. No. 18, May 1.
Conditions in the Chilean coal trade. No. 24, June 12.
Conditions in Sonora, Mexico. *Id.*
Conditions of Holland-South America freight service. No. 26, June 26.
Construction of roads in Cuba. No. 21, May 22.
Continued interest in Chilean fruit trade. No. 22, May 29.
Coffee shipments from Lower California. No. 20, May 15.
Cost of incorporating in Cuba. No. 22, May 29.
Crop liens in Cuba. No. 23, June 5.
Cuban general outlook more encouraging. *Id.*
Cuban manufacture of shoes. No. 25, June 19.
Cuban market for certain chemicals. No. 20, May 15.
Cuban tobacco crop and exports. No. 24, June 12.
Curaçao imports show increase in 1921. No. 26, June 26.
Customs regulations in Argentina. No. 21, May 22.
Id., in Brazil. No. 22, May 29.
Id., in Peru. Nos. 19 and 25, May 8 and June 19.
Demand for export products continues in Argentina. No. 18, May 1.
Dispersion of Mexican-textile industry. No. 26, June 26.
Development of the port of San Antonio, Chile. No. 24, June 12.
Economic conditions in Salvador good. *Id.*
Economic improvement continues in Chile. No. 18, May 1.

- Ecuadorean trade improving. No. 24, June 12.
- Effect of increased freight rates in Mexico. No. 20, May 15.
- Export duty in British Honduras decreased. No. 21, May 22.
- Exports from Antofagasta, Chile. No. 22, May 29.
- Exports from Rio de Janeiro to the United States. *Id.*
- Exports from the Guianas to the United States. *Id.*
- Exports of leather shoes to South America. No. 18, May 1.
- Federal Reserve Banks inspire confidence in Peru. *Id.*
- Foodstuffs prices in Buenos Aires. No. 24, June 12.
- Fuel consumption in Chilean mining industries. No. 21, May 22.
- German competition in Colombian rice trade. No. 25, June 19.
- German tire competition in Mexico. No. 26, June 26.
- Governmental licensing system for all exports in Ecuador. *Id.*
- Guatemalan market for rubber goods. No. 20, May 15.
- Harbor improvements at Arica, Chile. No. 25, June 19.
- Hondurean market for petroleum products. *Id.*
- Hydroelectric development in São Paulo, Brazil. *Id.*
- Import duties in Honduras. No. 21, May 22.
- Id.*, in Nicaragua. No. 23, June 5.
- Id.*, on cereals in Mexico. No. 22, May 19.
- Import restrictions in Peru. Nos. 20 and 26, May 15, and June 26.
- Imports of coal at Pernambuco, Brazil. No. 24, June 12.
- Imports show increases in Argentina. No. 23, June 5.
- Improved trade conditions in Central America. No. 22, May 29.
- Improvement in commercial condition in Brazil continues. No. 23, June 5.
- Incorporation under Uruguayan law. No. 25, June 19.
- Increasing business activity in Brazil. No. 25, June 19.
- Indian emigration commission to British Guiana. No. 23, June 5.
- Installation of plumbing in hospital at Panama City. No. 21, May 22.
- Latin American briefs. Nos. 21, 23, 24, and 25, May 22, and June 5, 12, and 19.
- Lease of Sul-Mineira Railroad in Brazil. No. 22, May 29.
- Leather footwear in Iquique, Chile. No. 21, May 22.
- Lumber-marking regulations in Haiti. No. 23, June 5.
- March coal imports at Pernambuco, Brazil. No. 21, May 22.
- Market awaits good roads in Peru. No. 25, June 19.
- Market for crepe paper in northern Chile. No. 22, May 29.
- Market for oil and alcohol lamps in Argentina. No. 19, May 8.
- Market for oil-burning equipment in Columbia. No. 25, June 19.

- Market for pianos in Vera Cruz. No. 24, June 12.
Market for rubber goods in Peru. No. 19, May 8.
Market in Chile for caustic soda. No. 18, May 1.
Mexican coinage of gold and silver. No. 22, May 29.
Mexican market for fruit and vegetable wrappers. No. 25, June 19.
Mexican mineral production for 1919-1921. No. 26, June 26.
Mexican trade and economic notes. No. 19, May 8.
Mexico increases railway rates. *Id.*
Mexico's economic condition not improved by corn situation. No. 21, May 22.
Mexico's official exhibition train to visit United States. *Id.*
Money scarcity felt in most districts in Mexico. No. 23, June 5.
Motion-picture censorship in Honduras. No. 21, May 22.
Municipal export taxes unlawful in Peru. No. 22, May 29.
New Austrian passenger car enters Mexican market. No. 25, June 19.
New Brazilian Express Company. No. 24, June 12.
New Brazilian municipal loan. No. 22, May 29.
New Chilean law in regard to bank checks. No. 24, June 12.
New Chilean nitrate prices. No. 25, June 19.
New customs tariff in British Honduras. No. 20, May 15.
Id., of British Virgin Islands. No. 21, May 22.
New insurance legislation in Honduras. No. 24, June 12.
New port in Guatemala. No. 23, June 5.
New radio equipment for Argentina army. No. 26, June 26.
New surtax on goods imported at Amapala, Honduras. No. 21, May 22.
New tanning company in Alagoas, Brazil. No. 19, May 8.
The Pacific Railroad of Nicaragua. No. 25, June 19.
Paper manufacture in Brazil. No. 18, May 1.
Paraguayan government exchange procedure. No. 20, May 15.
Paraguayan land holdings. *Id.*
Paraguayan market for rubber manufactures. No. 21, May 22.
Paving contract for Mazatlan, Mexico. *Id.*
Peruvian chambers of commerce. No. 22, May 29.
Petroleum export taxes in Mexico. No. 26, May 26.
The Petroleum market in Costa Rica. No. 24, June 12.
Petroleum shipments from Tampico district. No. 22, May 29.
Petroleum trade in Guatemala. No. 21, May 22.
Population of British Guiana in 1921. *Id.*
Present condition of Argentine paper market. No. 24, June 12.
Production of gold in Brazil. No. 20, May 15.

- Project to establish national banks in Paraguay. *Id.*
Proposed change in Cuban trade-mark law. No. 23, June 5.
Proposed change in the Cuban sales tax. No. 18, May 1.
Proposed change in Uruguayan tariff classification. No. 19, May 8.
Proposed establishment of paper industry in Yucatan. No. 21, May 22.
Proposed government monopoly on alcohol in Uruguay. No. 20, May 15.
Proposed Venezuelan water-power development. No. 21, May 22.
Provincial exposition at Trujillo, Peru. No. 26, June 26.
Pumps and lighting plants in Torreon, Mexico. No. 23, June 5.
Recent factors indicate easing of economic tension in Mexico. No. 18, May 1.
Recovery in import trade in Peru. No. 23, June 5.
Reduction of export duty on quebracho extract in Paraguay. No. 19, May 8.
Registration of trade-marks in Uruguay. No. 24, June 12.
Relaxation of import restrictions in Uruguay. No. 19, May 8.
Revision of Cuban commercial laws. No. 23, June 5.
Revival of Mexican railway project. No. 20, May 15.
Rubber-goods in Ecuador. *Id.*
Rules for oil exploitation on federal lands in Mexico. No. 21, May 22.
Sanitation tax in Honduras. No. 22, May 29.
Selling textiles in Mexico. No. 24, June 12.
Ships engaged in Mexican oil exports. No. 23, June 5.
Situation in Haiti analyzed. No. 21, May 22.
Small market for coal in Costa Rica. No. 25, June 19.
Id., in Ecuador. No. 20, May 15.
South-American railway notes. No. 23, June 5.
Standard sales conditions adopted in Argentina. No. 21, May 22.
The Statute of limitation in Cuba. No. 23, June 5.
Stocks of commodities at Rio de Janeiro. No. 26, June 26.
Strike in Vera Cruz, Mexico. No. 25, June 19.
Surtax on imports in Costa Rica. *Id.*
Survey of economic conditions in Cuba. No. 19, May 8.
Suspension of payments in Cuba. No. 20, May 15.
Tariff changes in Argentina. No. 25, June 19.
Id., in British Honduras. No. 18, May 1.
Id., in Costa Rica. No. 24, June 12.
Taxation of motor cars in Brazil. No. 25, June 19.
Tendency toward improvement in Colombia. No. 24, June 12.
Tire consumption in Porto Rico. No. 22, May 29.

Trade and crop conditions in Jamaica. *Id.*

Id., in Trinidad. No. 19, May 8.

Trinidad market for coal. No. 26, June 26.

Id., for manufactures of rubber. No. 23, June 5.

Typewriter sales in Chile. No. 19, May 8.

Uruguayan market for rubber goods. No. 20, May 15.

Venadium export tax in Peru. No. 26, June 26.

Venezuela well stocked with cotton goods. No. 20, May 15.

Venezuelan market for American rubber goods. No. 25, June 19.

Yucatan paper mill not yet assured. No. 26, June 26.

The Gregg Publishing Company of New York, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, and Liverpool, has published two small volumes which, while intended primarily for the use of students and others interested in the trade of Hispanic America, will prove of value to persons who wish to gain a practical and usable knowledge of Spanish, and they will aid also in helping the North American to understand Spanish-American customs. One is a *Manual de Correspondencia Comercial*, by Julio Mercado, instructor in Spanish in the Commercial High School of Brooklyn, N. Y. This small volume of 91 pages, which was copyrighted in 1920, aims "to furnish to students of Spanish a number of sample letters written in the correct language and form that are used by educated business men in the Spanish-speaking countries". In the 50 lessons will be found the most common business expressions, and in the exercises for translation from English to Spanish that form a part of each lesson, one can obtain essential information. While the volume is intended for high school and college students interested in foreign trade, it might well find a place on the desk of business and professional men who have occasion to write a letter in Spanish from time to time. The other book is entitled *Negocios con la América Española*, and was compiled by Earl S. Harrison, head of the Spanish Department of the school above mentioned. This work, which was copyrighted in 1921, and contains 108 pages, aims to "do its part in rounding out the knowledge of those who desire to master the language for commercial purposes." The text contains "various articles dealing with the general subjects of trade opportunities in Latin America, how to organize a trade campaign, and how to hold the trade after it has been secured, special articles on salesmen, shipping goods, packing and marking, invoices, quotations, custom-houses, marine insurance, trade-marks,

bills of exchange, and the financing of a shipment." The various steps of a complete transaction are also shown and a complete set of documents is presented. In his compilation, the author has made use of Ernest B. Filsinger's *Trading with Latin America* and *A Handbook of Finance and Trade with South America*, which was published by the National City Bank of New York. Each section of the text is accompanied by exercises in Spanish and in English. The documents are in English and are reproduced from actual paper forms used in trade. This volume, too, might well find a place on the desk among active helps. Both productions have excellent vocabularies. They have both been called forth by the impetus that has recently been given the study of Spanish in the United States.

Another number of the *Anales de la Academia de la Historia* which is published semi-annually in Habana, has appeared. This semi-annual number is a work of love with Sr. Dr. Don Domingo Figarola-Caneda, who is one of the leading regular members of the Academy of History, and director of this publication. This number is for the period January-June, 1920, and like its predecessors is a worthy contribution to the history of Cuba. In its making equal care has been expended as in previous numbers. The "Bibliografía de Enrique Piñeyro" is concluded in this volume. This interesting bibliography is published "Con una introducción, notas y un complemento", by Domingo Figarola-Caneda. The "Centón epistolario de Domingo del Monte", also with preface and annotations by Figarola-Caneda, is also concluded. Dr. Evelio Rodríguez Lendián concludes his "Elogio del Doctor Ramón Meza y Suárez Inclán"; and there is another installment by Carlos Manuel de Céspedes y Quesada on "Manuel de Quesada y Loynaz". This number is illustrated with the following engravings: the last picture of Enrique Piñeyro; Esquela mortuoria de Enrique Piñeyro; a picture of Domingo del Monte; a picture of General Manuel de Quesada; and "Combate de las Minas de Tanao de Juan Rodríguez. There is also a "Sección Oficial" consisting of the "Acta de la tercera sesión" of the Academy. At this meeting, the committee on rules made its report and action was taken article by article on the propositions submitted. Regular and corresponding members of the Academy were thus defined by the articles as finally adopted:

To be elected a regular member of the Academy, one must:

1. Possess ability, publicly demonstrated, in historical studies.
2. Reside in the city of Habana.
3. Be a Cuban citizen.

To be a corresponding member of the Academy, one must:

1. Possess ability, publicly demonstrated, in historical studies.
2. Reside in the provinces or in a foreign country.

Membership in the Academy is limited to thirty regular and thirty corresponding members. It appears from the inside back cover of the *Anales*, however, that the Academy has only sixteen regular members as yet, which probably means that membership is being jealously guarded and only those admitted who are worthy.

The number closes with a section entitled "Crónica", which consists of short notes and communications. Various appreciations are given of the first number of the *Anales*. The office of the *Anales* has been moved to Calle de Cuba, núm. 24, altos.

Now that the publication of the "Bibliografía" and the "Elogio" above mentioned has been completed, it is to be hoped that they will appear in book form, for these two bibliographies will be useful for historical study. The "Centón Epistolario", too, could assume a book form with profit, because of its value for history and literature. The life of Quesada y Loynaz is a real contribution to the history of Cuba.

In the numbers of the *Anales* already issued, the Director, Sr. Figarola-Caneda has sufficiently demonstrated his peculiar fitness for the task which he has set for himself. He is a careful and scholarly editor, and imbued, moreover, with enthusiasm for his work. It may not be known widely outside of Cuba that Señora Figarola-Caneda is also a scholarly bibliographer who has done considerable work on the bibliography of Cuba.

Biblos is the name of a bibliographical paper which is published weekly in Mexico by the Biblioteca Nacional, and which is now in its fourth year. This small four-page publication contains a great deal of interesting and useful information relative to Mexican men of letters, books, and other matters connected with libraries. The leading article in each number is usually one in a series entitled "Escritores Mexicanos Contemporáneos". This is followed often by short items, as for instance, "La Tuberculosis y las Bibliotecas Públicas"; by book reviews and bibliographical notes; and by a list of the publications recently received in the Biblioteca Nacional. In these days of Mexico's trial, we are apt to forget the very intense intellectual life in the country, especially that in the capital city. Mexico, unfortunately, has come to mean to many only bandits, oil, illiteracy, rebellion against constituted authority, and other unsavory things, so that it is well to remind

ourselves frequently of the other side, and to take account of the fact that Mexico has its share of scholars and practical men, and that there is under the surface a strong element that will have an immense influence on the Mexico of the future. Idealism and real patriotism are still living factors in Mexico. We should like to list all the titles in the volumes of *Biblos* for 1920 and 1921, which lie before us, but that is impossible for lack of space. Suffice it to say that the person who has access to this paper will gain much useful information regarding the writers and scholars of Mexico, and of other matters connected with books.

Nos. 52-53 of *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas*, published in Seville during 1922, contains the following: "Catálogo de legajos del Archivo General de Indias. Sección tercera. Casa de la Contratación de Indias (continued)", by Pedro Torres Lanzas; "Crónica Americanista", by Manuel Rodríguez-Navas; "Del trato que tuvieron los Indios por el libro VI de las Leyes de Indias", by Germán Latorre; "Escudos de armas, etc.", by Pedro Torres Lanzas; "Libro entitulado Coloquios de la Verdad. Trata de las causas e inconvenientes que impiden la doctrina e conversión de los indios de los reinos del Pirú, y de los daños e males, e agravios que padecen. Compuesto por Pedro de Quiroga, sacerdote que residió en aquellos reinos (continued)", edited from the original manuscript by Father Fray Julián Zarco Cuevos, O. S. A.

Educación, a small paper issued bimonthly in Managua, Nicaragua, in its number for November-December, 1921, contains the following articles: "El Exito"; "General Don Tomás Masís", by Pedro J. Morales; "José Joaquín Olmedo (1780-1847)"; "Las Matemáticas", by Julio Marín A.; "Nicarahuismos y Antillanismo", by Alfonso Valle; and "Patria, juventud e ideal", by José Angel Rodríguez. In January-February, 1922: "Con motivo del presbítero Dr. Simeón Cañas", by Rogerio de la Selva; "La Laguna misteriosa (Leyendas ometepiñas)", by J. M. Navas; "Libertad y libertinaje", by John Gáden; "Nuestras deficiencias en el ramo de instrucción pública"; "Para llegar a ser rentista"; and "Procedimientos industriales". In March-April: "La Cosmogonía por choque", by C. Mínima; "La Cruz del peregrino", by J. Le Brun; "La Escuela y el hogar"; "Fray Bartolomé de las Casas", by José Angel Rodríguez; "La Lengua materna", by Rufino J. Cuervo; and "Rufino J. Cuervo (1844-1911)".

History, of London, in its issue for April, 1922, published an interesting article by Arthur Percival Newton entitled "Christopher Columbus and his great enterprise".

Inter-America for June, 1922, contains the following translations: "Agustín Álvarez", by José Ingenieros (transl. from *América*, Buenos Aires, October and November, 1921); "The Beginnings of the University of Buenos Aires", by Ricardo Levene (transl. from *Revista Jurídica y de Ciencias Sociales*, Buenos Aires, August and September, 1921); "The Ecuadorean campaign: 1821-1822" (concluded), by Carlos A. Vivanco (transl. from *Boletín de la Biblioteca Nacional del Ecuador*, Quito, November and December, 1920); and "The Monroe Doctrine", by Félix Pérez Porta (transl. from *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922).

In *Mercurio Peruano*, for January, 1922, are found the following: "La Actualidad internacional", by César A. Ugarte; "El Cumplimiento del tratado de Ancón y la invitación de Chile para realizar el plebiscito", by Pedro Yrigoyen; and "Las Ideas políticas de Chocano".

Razón y Fe (Madrid) for May, 1922, contains a section by C. María Abad, entitled "Noticias generales", in which appear notes on Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Bolivia, and Colombia. The number for June has the following: "Crónica de Méjico"; Notes on Peru and Chile by C. María Abad; and "El Problema religioso en América", by C. Bayle, S. J.

The *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira* for March, 1922, contains: "A Conservação das forragens verdes", by N. Athanassof; and "Estrada de ferro norte de Matto Grosso", by João Baptista Vasques. For April-May: "Industrias agricolas", by Juvenal M. de Godoy; "Matto Grosso", by Paulo de Moraes Barros; and "O Problema das carnes", by F. T. de Souza Reis.

The *Revista de Costa Rica*, which is published at San José, Costa Rica, published the following in its issue for November, 1921: "Entierros indígenas en Costa Rica", by Paul Serre del Sagues; "Fragmentos de la Historia de Centro América por Robert Glasgow Dunlop", transl. from English by Rafael Fernández Guardia (also in the following number); "Informe sobre la isla de Coco", by R. McCartney Pasemore; "La Subregión fitogeográfica Costarricense", by Carlos Werckle; and

"Temblores registrados en el observatorio nacional durante el año 1920", by R. Fernández Peralta and Rafael M. Tristán. In December, 1921–January, 1922: "A los ciudadanos patriotas y a las damas de Costa Rica", by Gumersindo Busto; "Apuntes sobre los Indios Bribris de Costa Rica", by Agustín Blessing; "Costa Rica, su orografía e hidrografía", by Henri F. Pittier (also in the following number); "La Jura de Don Luis I.", by Rafael Fernández Guardia; "El Naturalista Mociño", by Rafael Heliodoro Valle; and "Un Volcán olvidado", by Rafael Fernández Peralta. In February, 1922: "Cuentos Bribris", by Carlos Gagini; "El Dr. Don José María Castro", by Rafael Villegas; "En los cerros de Candelaria", by Lucas Raúl Chacón; "La Familia real de Talamanca", by J. Fidel Tristán; "Reliquias existentes en la iglesia de Orosi", by Eladio Prado; and "La Tentativa de empréstito chileno y el empréstito peruano de 1856", by Álvaro Bonilla Lara.

The *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires* for January, 1922, contains a number of interesting articles, and other material, among which may be mentioned the following: "Antiproyecto de ley para la jubilación de los abogados de la capital"; "Aplicabilidad del nuevo código penal"; "El Divorcio ante el derecho internacional privado", by Alcides Calandrelli; "Federación de Colegios de Abogados"; "La Legislación procesal en Corrientes", by J. Honorio Silgueira; "La Ley de alquileres", by Juan A. González Calderón; "Ley modificando el código de procedimientos en lo criminal de la capital"; "La Nueva constitución de Santa Fe"; "Nulidades absolutas y relativas", by Dalmacio Vélez Sarsfield; "Práctica procesal", by Tomás Arias; "Las Transformaciones del derecho penal contemporánea", by Octavio González Roura; and "Unificación de fueros", by Clodomiro Zavalia.

Following is the table of contents of the first volume of the General Introduction to the *Diccionario Historico, Geographico e Ethnographico do Brasil*, which is being prepared by the Instituto Historico e Geographico Brasileiro in commemoration of the centenary of the independence of Brazil:

Chapters

1. a. Posição geographica; superficie; limites—
- b. Descrição das fronteiras
- c. Descrição do littoral—Portos
- d. Ilhas oceanicas—Pharóes—Hora legal
2. Orographia

Authors

- Alm. J. C. Guillobel e a comissão.
 Othello de Souza Reis.
 Alfredo Lisboa.
 Carlos Carneiro.
 Theodoro Sampaio.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 3. Hydrographia | Theodoro Sampaio. |
| 4. Clima | Henrique Morize |
| 5. Fauna | Alipio de M. Ribeiro |
| 6. Flora | Olympio da Fonseca |
| 7. Mineraes e constituição geologica | Theodoro Sampaio |
| 8. Aspecto geral da physiographia brasileira | Othello de Sousa Reis |
| 9. População | Carlos Carneiro |
| 10. Ethnographia | Rodolpho Garcia |
| a. indigena | |
| b. nossos problemas ethnicos | Oliveira Vianna |
| 11. Imigração colonização | A. Tavares de Lyra |
| 12. Organização politica | Luiz Nunes Ferreira |
| 13. Regime eleitoral | A. Tavares de Lyra |
| 14. Defesa Nacional | |
| a. Exercito | |
| b. Marinha | |
| c. Forças de 1ª e 2ª linhas | |
| d. Aviação militar | |
| 15. Instrução publica | Carlos Carneiro |
| 16. Desportos | Oliveira Santos |
| 17. Hygiena e Saude Publica | Diversos |
| 18. Agricultura | J. Paranhos Fontenelle |
| 19. Industria | Commissão S. N. Agricult. |
| a. em geral | |
| b. manufactureira | A. Getulio das Neves |
| 20. Commercio | F. T. de Sousa Reis |
| a. em geral | |
| b. movimento bancario | Ramalho Ortigão |
| 21 Vias de comunicação | Nuno Pinheiro |
| a. maritima | |
| b. portos | Raul Tavares |
| c. fluvial | Alfredo Lisboa |
| d. ferrea | Lucas Bicalho |
| 22. Correios—Telegraphos—Telephonios | Palhano de Jesus |
| 23. Historia geral | A. Tavares de Lyra |
| a. Do descob. á independ. | |
| b. Da independ. até hoje | Gastão Ruch |
| 24. Hist. das explorações scientificas | Jonathas Serrano |
| 25. Archeologia brasileira | Rodolpho Garcia |
| 26. Historia politica | Theodoro Sampaio |
| 27. Historia diplomatica | Basilio de Magalhães |
| a. em geral | |
| b. dos limites | A. Pinto da Rocha |
| 28. Historia administrativa | C. Brandenburger |
| 29. Historia economica e financeira | Oliveira Santos |
| 30. Historia judiciaria | Agenor de Roure |
| 31. Historia militar | Aurelino Leal |
| a. Exercito | |
| b. Marinha | Moreira Guimarães |
| | Carlos Carneiro |

32. Historia religiosa	D. Duarte Leopoldo
33. Historia scientifica	
a. medicina	Alvaro Reis
b. Mathematicas	Ignacio do Amaral
34. Historia litteraria	Alfredo Gomes e R. Carv°.
35. Historia da imprensa	Max Fleiuss
36. Historia artistica	Argeu Guimarães
37. Biographias	
a. imperantes	
b. exrangeitos illustres	Diversos

The Journal of International Relations, which was founded by Professor George H. Blakeslee, of Clark University and published under the auspices of the University, has been transferred to the Council on Foreign Relations, of New York City. The general character of the Journal it is announced remain unchanged. Professor A. C. Coolidge will be editor-in-chief of the Journal under its new management. It is to be hoped, however, that Professor Blakeslee is not withdrawing his interest from this very useful publication, for he is very largely responsible for bringing it up to its present standard of excellence. He has fostered it carefully and given it a foremost place among publications of its type the world over. With larger funds at its disposal than heretofore, it is expected that the Journal will enlarge its scope and usefulness. Under the new management the list of contributing editors has been discontinued.

The Hondurean scholar, Sr. D. Rafael Heliodoro Valle, formerly in Washington, but at present in Mexico, in the issue of *El Libro y el Pueblo* for June 1, 1922, writes on "La Situación Bibliografica Hispano-Americana". In this he reviews lucidly, although in very rapid survey, the bibliographical situation with respect to Hispanic America as it appears in the various American countries, including the United States. As never before, facilities are being offered for consecutive and careful study.

A. Curtis Wilgus, Teaching Fellow in History of the University of California, has completed the first draft of a text book of Hispanic American history. The volume treats of the following topics:

1. The Western Hemisphere before Columbus.
2. Southern Europe before Columbus.
3. Columbus and his Contemporaries 1486-1519.
4. Explorers, Conquerors and Colonizers 1519-1535.

5. Spanish Expansion 1535-1600.
6. Portuguese Expansion 1535-1600.
7. Spanish and Portuguese Colonial Administration to 1600.
8. Spanish Colonies 1600-1800.
9. Portuguese Colonies 1600-1800.
10. The Prelude to Independence 1750-1808.
11. The Independence of Spain's Possessions 1808-1824.
12. Brazil: Kingdom, Empire and Republic 1808-1922.
13. The Progressive States of Spanish Origin 1824-1922.
14. The Backward States 1824-1922.
15. Central America and the West Indies to 1922.
16. Inter-Hispanic American Relations 1808-1922.
17. Hispanic American and the United States (Treaties, conventions, diplomatic controversies, Intervention, etc.).
18. Hispanic America and the United States (Recognition, Monroe Doctrine and Pan Americanism).
19. Hispanic America and Europe 1808-1922.

Mr. Wilgus plans an appendix which shall contain among other things, the constitutions of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico. Each chapter will be followed by an extensive bibliography composed of two parts: one for the student, for general and special reading, and the other for the teacher and those students who handle foreign languages. The text will be accompanied by illustrations and maps. Mr. Wilgus has also in preparation another book which will probably be entitled *A Guide and Atlas to Hispanic American History*.

William Spence Robertson's textbook of Hispanic American history has just appeared from the press of D. Appleton & Co. This impressive volume, which will be welcomed by all teachers of Hispanic American history, is entitled *History of the Latin-American Nations*. It will be reviewed in a later issue of THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

- Aguayo, Alfredo M.: *La Universidad y sus problemas; discurso inaugural del curso académico de 1921 a 1922*. Habana, Imp. "El Siglo XX", 1921. Pp. 110.
- Albiñana Sanz, José: *La situación de Méjico vista desde España; conferencia*. Madrid, 1921.
- Altamira, Rafael: *La política de España en América*. Valencia, Editorial Edeta", 1921. Pp. vi, 230, (2).
- América libre; obra dedicada a conmemorar el centenario de la independencia de Guayaquil, 1820-1920. Guayaquil, 1920. Pp. 376. Illus.; ports.
- Andrade Coello, Alejandro: *Juan León Mera, considerado como crítico*. Quito, Imp. de la Univ. Central, 1920. Pp. 32.
- André, Marius: *La fin de l'empire espagnol d'Amérique*. Paris, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, [1922]. Pp. 192. Preface by Charles Maurras.
- Araquistáin, Luis: *El peligro yanqui*. Madrid, 1921. Pp. 204.
- Asensio, Esteban de: *Memorial de la fundación de la provincia de Santa Fe del Nuevo Reino de Granada del orden de San Francisco 1550-1585*. Publicalo por vez primera el R.P. Atanasio López. Madrid, V. Suárez, 1921. Pp. 55, (1). (Publicaciones del Archivo Histórico Ibero-Americano, I.)
- Asociación de empleados civiles de la nación, Montevideo: *Estatuto del funcionario, proyecto del Sr. José Antonio Mora y resolución de la Comisión directiva*.—Exposición de motivos del autor del proyecto.—Dictamen de la Comisión informante.—Nota al Ministerio de industrias. Montevideo, Talleres gráficos de la Papelería Schmidt, 1921.
- Ayarragaray, Lucas: *La iglesia en América y la dominación española. Estudio de la época colonial*. Buenos Aires, J. Lajouane y Ca., 1920. Pp. 321.
- Azevedo, João Lucio d': *Historia dos Christãos Novos Portugueses*. Lisboa, Livraria Clássica Editora, 1922. Pp. x, 518.
- Barrio Lorenzat, Francisco del: *El trabajo en México durante la época colonial; ordenanzas de gremios de la Nueva España*. Méxias, Secretaría de Gobernación, 1920. Pp. vi, 315.
- Bécker, Jerónimo: *La política española en las Indias*. Madrid, 1920. Pp. xiv, 454.
- Bécker, Jerónimo, and José María Rivas Groot: *El Nuevo Reino de Granada en el siglo XVIII*. 1. parte. Madrid, Impr. del Asilo de Huérfanos del S. C. de Jesús, 1921.
- Belaúnde, Víctor Andrés: *Nuestra cuestión con Chile*. Lima, Sanmartí y Ca., 1919. Pp. xxvii, 262.
- Bermejo de la Rica, Antonio: *La colonia del Sacramento. Su origen, desenvolvimiento y vicisitudes de su historia*. Madrid, 1920. Pp. viii, 308. (Biblioteca de Historia Hispanoamericana.)

- Blakeslee, George H.: *Mexico and the Caribbean*. Clark University Lectures. New York, G. E. Stechert & Co., 1920. Pp. x, 363.
- Blanco y Sánchez, R.: *El año pedagógico hispanoamericano*. Madrid, Perlado, Páez y Cía., 1920. Pp. 320.
- Boix, Emilio: *El libro de la Argentina*. Contribución al estudio del libro español en la América Española. Madrid, Imp. del Ministerio de Estado, 1920. Pp. 35.
- Boletín de la Sección Argentina de la International Law Association—Número V. Conferencia de Buenos Aires—1922. Buenos Aires, Talleres Gráficos Schenone Hnos. y Linari, 1921. Pp. 56.
- Boletín de la Secretaría de Educación Pública. Tomo 1, no. 1. México, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1922. Pp. iii, 607, V.
- Boletín de la Universidad. México, 1921. Pp. 408.
- Bolívar, Simón: *Cartas, 1823, 1824, 1825*. (Con un apéndice que contiene cartas de 1801 a 1822; notas de R. Blanco-Fombona. Madrid, Editorial América, 1921. Pp. xv, 427. Port.
- Borchard, Edwin M.: *Opinions on the controversy between Peru and Chile, known as the Question of the Pacific*. Washington, [1920]. Pp. 40. Map.
- Bunge, Augusto: *Ley orgánica de mutualidades y seguros populares; proyecto de ley y exposición de motivos presentado en la sesión del 22 de setiembre de 1919*. Buenos Aires, Talleres Gráficos Argentinos de L. J. Rosso y Cía., 1920. Pp. 256.
- Bucich, Escobar, Ismael: *Buenos Aires—Ciudad*. Buenos Aires, Moro, Tello & Cía., [1921?]. Pp. 219.
- Bustamante, Antonio S. de: *Controversia de límites entre Panamá y Costa Rica*. Panamá, Impr. Nacional, 1921. Pp. 20.
- Caillava, Domingo A.: *La literatura gauchesca en el Uruguay*. Montevideo, C. García, 1921. Pp. viii, 71.
- Cammarota, Antonio: *Nociones del concordato y de la quebra (somero aspecto histórico y comparado)*. Buenos Aires, Valerio Abeledo, Editor, 1921.
- Campos, Rubén M.: *Chapultepec, su leyenda y su historia*. México, 1919. Pp. 38, and 66 plates.
- Carpena, F. (hijo): *Apuntes complementarios de derecho marítimo*. Buenos Aires, Valerio Abeledo, Editor, 1921.
- Castello, Manuel F.: *Legislación de aguas*. Buenos Aires, 1921.
- Castillo y Piña, José: *La cuestión social en México*. Tlálpam, D. F., Imprenta del Asilo "Patricio Sanz", 1921.
- Central America (Federación de Centro América, 1921-) *Constitución: Constitución política de la República de Centroamérica*. San Salvador, Imprenta Nacional, 1921. Pp. 111.
- Cooper, Clayton S.: *Foreign trade markets and methods*. New York and London, D. Appleton & Co., 1922. Pp. xv, 440. (Chapters 27 and 28 treat of Hispanic America.)
- Cortázar, Roberto, and Luis Augusto Cuervo: *Congreso de Angostura*. Libro de actas. Bogotá, Imprenta Nacional, 1921. Pp. 330. (Biblioteca de Historia Nacional, XXXIV.)
- Cruz Saldaña Retamar, Reginaldo de la; *Los Dominicos en la independencia argentina; monografía documentada*. Buenos Aires, 1920. Pp. (1), (3)—192. Illus.; plates, ports.

- Dávila, Vicente: Centenario de Carabobo. Caracas, Impr. Bolívar, 1921. Pp. 22.
- Díaz, Emilio C.: El código penal para la República Argentina. Estudio de sus disposiciones. [Buenos Aires, 1921?].
- Dillon, E. J.: Mexico on the Verge. New York, George H. Doran Co., 1921. Pp. 296.
- Directorio General de la República El Salvador. San Salvador, W. L. Bennet & Co., 1920. Pp. 152.
- Durú, Francisco: Leyes 11,156 y 11,157. ¿Son? ¿Y por qué son? Inconstitucionales? Buenos Aires, 1921.
- Echagüe, Juan Pablo: Un teatro en formación. Buenos Aires, Imp. Tragant, 1919. Pp. 404.
- Estrada, V. E.: ¿Moratorio o Conversión? Estudio económico sobre la conveniencia de mantener vigente el decreto legislativo de agosto 30 de 1914. Guayaquil, Imp. Gutenberg, 1921. Pp. 63.
- Fabela, Isidro: Los Estados Unidos contra la libertad; estudios de historia diplomática americana (Cuba, Filipinas, Panamá, Nicaragua, República Dominicana). Barcelona, Talleres Gráficos "Lux", [1921]. Pp. 311.
- Falcão Espalter, Mario: La vigia Lecor. Historia de la dominación portuguesa en el Uruguay. Montevideo, Imprenta y Casa Editorial "Renacimiento", 1919. Pp. 225, (7). Plate.
- Fansler, Dean Spruill: Filipino popular tales, Collected and edited with comparative notes, by . . . Lancaster, Pa., and New York, The American Folk-Lore Society, 1921. Pp. xix, 473. (Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society, Vol. XII.)
- Fernández Saldaña, José, and César Miranda: Historia general de la ciudad y el departamento del Salto. Montevideo, Imprenta Nacional, 1920. Pp. 404.
- Gagini, Carlos: Diccionario de Costarrriqueñismos. 2d ed. San José, Impr. Nacional, 1919. Pp. 275.
- Ganuza, Marcelino: Monografía de las misiones vivas de Agustinos Recoletos (Candelarios) en Colombia. Bogotá, [1921?].
- García, Rodolpho: Diccionario de brasileirismos (peculiaridades pernambucanas). Rio de Janeiro, Impr. Nacional, 1915. Pp. xxviii, 291.
- González, Luis Felipe: Historia de la influencia extranjera en el desenvolvimiento educacional y científico de Costa Rica. San José, Impr. Nacional, 1921. Pp. xi, 317.
- Graham, R. B. Cunningham: Cartagena and the banks of the Sinú. New York, G. H. Doran [1921?]. Pp. xiv, 247. Port.
- Hall, Arnold Bennett: The Monroe Doctrine and the Great War. Chicago, A. C. McClurg & Co., 1920. Pp. xiv, 177.
- Hall, Trowbridge: California trails: Intimate guide to the old missions. The story of the California missions. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920. Pp. (12), 243.
- A Handbook of Mexico. Prepared by the Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, Naval Staff, Admiralty. London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1920. Pp. 550, and portfolio of maps.
- Harrison, Francis Burton: The cornerstone of Philippine independence. New York, The Century co., 1922. Pp. xi, 343.

- Hoskins, Halford Lancaster: *Guide to Latin-American history*. Boston, New York, Chicago, D. C. Heath & Co., 1922. Pp. x, 121.
- Hernández, Ricardo: *Leyendas del Uruguay* (primera serie). Montevideo, [O. M. Bertani], 1918. Pp. 342.
- Honduras. *Límites entre Honduras y Nicaragua*. Mediación del gobierno de los Estados Unidos; alegatos, pruebas y dictámenes presentados por Honduras ante el mediador, demostrando la validez y justicia del laudo pronunciado por el rey de España, que puso término a la cuestión. New York, [De Laisne & Carranza, Inc., 1921.] Pp. ii, 382.
- El ideal latino-americano. México, Impr. de la Secretaría de Gobernación, 1919. Pp. xxxiii, 564.
- Ingenieros, José: *La evolución de las ideas argentinas*. Libro 2. *La restauración*. Buenos Aires, L. J. Rosso y Cía, 1920.
- Instituto Histórico y Geográfica del Uruguay. *Revista*. Montevideo, 1921. Pp. 680.
- Jefferson, Mark: *Recent colonization in Chile*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1921. Pp. 52. Front.; Illus. (American Geographical Society Research Series, No. 6.)
- Jones, Chester Lloyd: *Mexico and its reconstruction*. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1921. Pp. xi, 330. Map.
- Kellogg, Frederic R.: *The world petroleum problem*. Mexico. New York, Association of petroleum producers in Mexico, [1921]. Pp. 45.
- Killik, Stephen H. M.: *Manual of Argentina railways for 1921*. London, E. Wilson, 1921. Pp. 77. Folding map.
- Larsen, Sofus: *Danmark og Portugal i det 15 de aarhundrede*. (In *Aarboger for Nordisk oldkyndighed og historie*, 1919. III række, 9. bind, pp. 236-312).
- Legón, Faustino J.: *Doctrina y ejercicio del patronato nacional*. Buenos Aires, J. Lajouane & Cía, 1920. Pp. 628.
- Leguizamón, Martiniano: *Rasgos de la vida de Urquiza*. Buenos Aires, 1920.
- Lehmann, Walter: *Zentral-Amerika*. Teil I. *Die Sprachen Zentral-Amerikas in ihren Beziehungen zueinander sowie zu Süd-Amerika und Mexiko*. Band II. Berlin, D. Reimer, 1920. Pp. xii, 597-1090. Map.
- Llaca y Argudín, Francisco: *Organización de los tribunales de Cuba y su personal desde xxx 1º de enero de 1899 hasta 31 de julio de 1919*. Habana, Impr. de Rambla, Bouza y C., 1919. Pp. 243.
- López, Jacinto: *La tración en Guatemala*. New York, Casa Editorial La Reforma, 1922. Pp. 11.
- Loria, Francisco: *México y su riqueza*. Mexías, Talleres de Excelsior. 1920. Pp. 208.
- Mahony, Thomas H.: *The Monroe Doctrine; the vital necessity of its continued maintenance*. [N. p.], 1921. Pp. 91.
- Martínez Lemus, Vicente: *La Unión de Centro-América y "la Buena Prensa"*. Santa Tecla, El Salvador, Imprenta "La Inmaculda", 1921. (Discurso pronunciado en la Segunda Asamblea General de la Soc. "La Buena Prensa".)
- Mejía, Gustavo Adolfo; *Acuso a Roma*. "Yo contra el invasor". Habana, Imp. El Figaro, 1920. Pp. 120.

- Las Misiones Católicas en Colombia. Informes. Años 1919, 1920, 1921. Bogotá, Inprenta Nacional, 1921.
- Mitjano, Aurelio: Historia de la literatura cubana. Prólogo de Rafael Montoro. Madrid, Editorial-America, [1918]. (Sociedad Española de Librería.) Pp. 389.
- Monner Sans, José M.. La historia considerada como género literario. Buenos Aires, 1921.
- Muzzio, Julio A.. Diccionario histórico y biográfico de la República Argentina. 2 vols. Buenos Aires, J. Roldán, [1920.]
- Myers, Denys Peter: Manual of collections of treaties and of collections relating to treaties. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1922. Pp. xvii, 685.
- Nuttall, Zelia: Algunos datos sobre Hernán Cortes y su primera esposa Doña Catalina Xuarez. México, Imprenta de la Secretaría de Gobernación, 1921. Pp. (11).
- D Francisco Cervantes de Salazar. Paris, Au siège de la Société des Americanistes de Paris, 1921. Reprint from *Journal de la Société des Americanistes de Paris*, new series, XIII, 1 1921, pp. 59-90.
- Los jardines del antiguo México. México, Sociedad Científica "Antonio Alzate", 1920. Reprint from pp. 193-213 of *Memorias Sociedad "Alzate"*, tomo 37.
- Oliveira Lima, Manoel de: Historia de civilização (Traços Geraes). São Paulo, Editora-Proprietaria Companhia Melhoramentos de São Paulo, 1921. Pp. 712. Maps.
- Ortiz, Fernando: Los Cabildos afrocubanos. Habana, Imprenta y Papelería "La Universal", 1921. Pp. 37. Reprint from *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, XVI. No. 1.
- Pardo de Tavera, T. H.: El Carácter de Rizal. Manila, Imprenta Manila Filatélica, 1918. Pp. 41. Reprinted from *The Philippine Review*, May, 1917.
- The Legacy of ignorantism (ignorantismo). An address delivered before the Teachers Assembly, Baguio, April 23. 1920. Manila, Bureau of Printing. 1921. Pp. 40. (In both English and Spanish.)
- Liliw, Laguna. Manila, The Times Press, [1921?]. Pp. 16. (Early pre-Spanish and Spanish history of this Filipino town.)
- El Viaje de Magallanes. Conferencia del 5 de febrero de 1920. Manila, Bureau of Printing, 1921. Illus.; maps.
- Parker, William Belmont: Argentines of to-day. New York, The Hispanic Society of America, 1920.
- Cubans of to-day. 2 vols. New York, Hispanic Society of America, 1919.
- Paraguayans of to-day. New York, The Hispanic Society of America, 1921.
- Pastells, Pablo, S. J.: El descubrimiento del estrecho de Magallanes. Madrid, Sucs. de Rivadeneira, 1920.
- Peck, Annie S.: Industrial and commercial South America. New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1922. Pp. xviii, 509.
- Peruvian textiles; a contribution to our knowledge of the textile industries of the textile industries of the ancient Peruvian people. New York, H. C. Perleberg, [1921?]. 40 plates.

- Posada, Eduardo: Instrucción cívica. Bogotá, Camacho y Roldán, 1920. Pp. 200.
- Posada Gutiérrez, Joaquín: Memorias histórico-políticas. Últimos días de la Gran Colombia y del Libertador. Tomo x I. Madrid, Gráfica Ambos Mundos, 1920. Pp. 332. (Biblioteca Ayacucho.)
- Powell, A. Alexander: Asia at the crossroads. New York, The Century Co., 1922. Pp. xxi, 369. (Part 4 treats of the Philippines.)
- Puccio, Adelchi Carlomagno: La Sociedad de las Naciones y el proyecto Wilson. Buenos Aires, 1920. Pp. 68.
- Quesada, Ernesto: Rafael Obligada.—El poeta.—El hombre. Buenos Aires, 1920.
- Quijano, Arturo: La Liga de las Naciones, Bolívar, Napoleón, Wilson; el peligro Monroe. Bogotá, Impr. Nacional, 1919, Pp. 32.
- Republic of Nicaragua: Report of the collector-general of customs for the period of January 1, 1920 to December 31, 1920, and the statistics of the commerce of 1920. Managua, 1921. Pp. 89.
- The same. January 1, 1921 to December 31, 1921 and the statistics of the commerce of 1921. Managua, 1922. Pp. 113. (Submitted to the honorable minister of finance and public credit, Republic of Nicaragua, and the honorable secretary of state, United States of America.)
- El Reporter Latino-Americano; guía para los compradores de la América Latina, 1921. Directorio completo y clasificado de las principales firmas de los Estados Unidos de América de calzado, cueros e industrias anexas. Boston, Shoe and Leather Reporter Co., 1921. Pp. 370.
- República de Argentina. Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto: Línea de frontera con Chile. Coordenadas geográficas de los hitos erigidos sobre la misma. Datos argentinos, 1917-1918. Buenos Aires, 1920. Pp. 20. 492 landmarks.
- Robertson, William Spence: History of the Latin-American nations. New York and London, D. Appleton and Company, 1922. Pp. xxiii, 617.
- Rocuant, Miguel Luis: San Sebastián del Río de Janeiro. Madrid, Editorial Rivadeneyra, 1922.
- Rodríguez Villa, Antonio: El teniente general don Pablo Morillo, primer conde de Cartagena, marqués de la Puerta (1778-1837). Tomo 2, y ultimo. Madrid, J. Pueyo, 1920. Pp. 295. (Biblioteca Ayacucho.)
- Rowe, L. S.: The Federal system of the Argentine Republic. Washington, Published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921. Pp. vii, 161.
- Latin, America as a factor in International relations. (In E. A. Walsh's The History and Nature of International Relations, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1922, pp. 203-215.)
- Russell, Charles Edward: The Outlook for the Philippines. New York, The Century Co. Pp. 411.
- Sánchez de Bustamante, Teodoro: La libertad de tarificar en la legislación argentina. (Régimen de las leyes 2873 y 5315). Estudio técnico-económico. Buenos Aires, Casa Editora Coni, 1922.
- Sherwood, F. A.: Glimpses of South America. New York, The Century Co. 1920. Pp. ix, 409.
- Silva Rocha, Joaquim da: Historia da colonisação do Brasil. Vol. I. Rio de Janeiro, Imprensa Nacional, 1919.

- Sosa, Sixto: Pastoral de promulgación del patronato diocesano de nuestra Señora del Valle. Caracas, Tipografía Americana, 1921.
- Stábile De-Nucci, María Luisa: Derecho civil argentino. Buenos Aires, Valerio Abeledo, Editor, 1921.
- Stichel, B.: Argentinien. Hamburg, 1919. Pp. 171.
- Esquivel Obregón, Toribio: Latin American commercial law: New York, Banks Law Publishing Co., 1921. Pp. xxiii, 927. (With the collaboration of Edwin M. Borchard.)
- Subercaseaux, Guillermo: El sistema monetario y la organización bancaria de Chile. Santiago, Impú y Lit. Universo, 1921. Pp. 404.
- Terán, Juan B.: Por mi ciudad. Buenos Aires, Librería "La Facultad" de Juan Roldán, 1920. Pp. 260.
- Teschner, Carlos: Historia de Rio Grande do Sul dos primeiros seculos. 2 vols. Porto Alegre, S. J. Livreria Selbach de J. R. da Fonseca & Cia., 1918-1920.
- Teuma, Emilio: "Grandes hombres de Cuba"—Fermín Váldes Domínguez. Conferencia leída en la sesión solemne que en homenaje a la memoria del prócer celebró la sección de Ciencias Históricas del Ateneo de la Habana el día 22 de Enero de 1922. Habana, Imprenta "El Siglo XX", 1922. Pp. 20. (Reprinted from *Cuba Contemporánea*.)
- Thompson, Wallace: The Mexican Mind. New York, Little, Brown and Company, 1922.
- The people of Mexico; who they are and how they live. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1921. Pp. xiii, 427.
- Trelles, Carlos M.: Estadística de mortalidad por fiebre amarilla en la Isla de Cuba en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX. Trabajo presentado al V. Congreso Médico Nacional, Habana, Diciembre, 1921. Habana, Montalvo, Cardenas y Cía., 1922. Pp. 8.
- Universidad Nacional de la Plata: Revista del Museo de la Plata. Vol. XXV. (3d series, vol. 7.) Buenos Aires, Imprenta y Casa Editora "Coni", 1921. Pp. 400.
- Urioste, Antero: La Biblioteca de Maestros del Consejo N. de Enseñanza Primaria y Normal. Su evolución y su estado actual. Montevideo, Talleres Gráficos A. Barreiro y Ramos, 1922.
- Valdés-Roig, Luis: El comercio exterior de Cuba y la guerra mundial: la enorme prosperidad económica de Cuba; extraordinario desarrollo de nuestras relaciones mercantiles; la intervención de Cuba en el conflicto europeo y su influencia sobre el porvenir de la "industria azucarera". Habana, Impr. "Avisador Comerical", 1920. Pp. xvi, 320. Tables.
- Vallenilla Lanz, Laureano: Cesarismo democrático: Estudio sobre las bases sociológicas de la constitución efectiva de Venezuela. Caracas, Empresa "El Cojo", 1919. Pp. 307. (Prologue by Antonio Gómez Restrepo.)
- Varona, Enrique José: Ramillete poético; colección de sonetos heroicos, sagrados, filosóficos, amorosos y festivos de ensignes poetas españoles. Babana, Impr. "El Siglo", 1921. Pp. 232.
- Vignaud, Henry: The columbian tradition on the discovery of America and of the part played therein by the astronomer Toscanelli. Oxford 1920.
- Villafañe, Benjamín: Irigoyen: el último dictador. Buenos Aires, Casa Editorial Moro y Tells, 1922.

- Worcester, Dean C.: The Philippines past and present. 3d ed. Two vols. in one. New York, Macmillan Company, 1922. Pp. 1, 1024. Map; index; illus.
- Wright, Irene A.: Nuestra Señora de la Caridad, de Cobre (Santiago de Cuba) y de Illescas (Casilla) Con un apéndice de documentos inéditos del Archivo de Indias (Pevilla). Asociación Española para el progreso de las Ciencias. Congreso de Oporto.—Tomo VIII. Ciencias históricas y filológicas. Sevilla, Jiménez y Molina, impresores, [1921?]. Pp. 35-43. (Session of June 30, 1921.)
- Yrigoyen, Pedro: La adhesión de la República Argentina al tratado de alianza defensiva Perú-Boliviano de 1873. Lima, Sanmartí y Cía, 1919. Pp. xviii, 289.
- Zeballos, Estanislao S.: Mujeres notables de Sud América: Flora Cavalcanti Albuquerque Mello de Oliveira Lima. Buenos Aires, Talleres Gráficos Schenone Hnos. y Linari, 1921. Pp. 6. (Reprint from *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*.)
- Zelaya, Ramón. Mea culpa centroamericana. San José, C. R., Imprenta Alsina, 1920. Pp. 58.

IN PERIODICALS

- Abad, C. María: Noticias generales. Argentina, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Bolivia, Colombia. In *Razón y Fe* (Madrid), May, 1922.
- Noticias. Perú, Chile. In *id.*, June, 1922.
- La Actual situación en Cuba juzgada por Varona. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922.
- Adams, Harriet Chalmers: Volcano girded Salvador. In *The National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1922.
- Aldao, Carlos A.: La entrevista de Guayaquil. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Álvarez, Alejandro: The need of a new conception of law. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Revista de Filosofía*, Buenos Aires, July, 1921).
- Álvaro Miller, Abilio: O ensino da logica nos gymnasios officiaes Paulistas. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.
- Antiproyecto de ley para la jubilación de los abogados de la capital. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Aplicabilidad del nuevo código penal. In *id.*
- Arango, Miguel: En pro de la reciprocidad arancelaria con los Estados Unidos., In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, November-December, 1921.
- Are Mexican payments probable? In *The Financial World* (New York), June 10, 1922.
- Arias, Tomás: Práctica procesal. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Arneson, Edwin P.: Early irrigation in Texas. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, October, 1921.
- Arrús, Oscar F.: El Problema del cambiô en el Perú y el alza del cambio sobre Nueva York. In *Revista de Economía Argentina* (Buenos Aires), January, 1922.
- Art and education. In *Mid-Pacific Magazine* (Honolulu), September, 1921.

- Athanassof, N.: A conservação das forragens verdes. In *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, March-April, 1922.
- Bayle, C., S. J.: El problema religioso en América. In *Razón y Fe*, June, 1922.
- Benitez, Cecilio: Santa María de la Rábida y Martín Alonso Pinzón. In *Blanco y Negro*, May 28, 1922.
- Blessing, Agustín: Apuntes sobre los Indios Bribris de Costa Rica. In *Revista de Costa Rica* (San José), December, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Bolívar, Simón: A biography of Sucre. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *La Prensa*, Lima, December 17, 1921).
- Bonilla Lara, Álvaro: La tentativa de empréstito chileno y el empréstito peruano de 1856. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, February, 1922.
- Borges, Carlos: En la casa de Bolívar. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- Borja G. y Urrutia, H.: La obra filosófica de Prado. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- Boza, Edilberto C.: La obra y el pensamiento político de Prado. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- O Brazil pittoresco. In *Ilustração Brasileiro*, December, 1920.
- Buceta, Erasmo: En torno de "Los intereses creados". In *Hispania*, November, 1921.
- Bunge, Mauricio: El cambio y la crisis. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, December, 1921.
- La crisis ganadera y los arrendamientos. In *id.*, March, 1922.
- Bustamante Cisneros, R.: Javier Prado: el educador; el maestro. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- Busto, Gumersindo: A los ciudadanos patriotas y a las damas de Costa Rica. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, December, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Cáceres, Julián R.: El Río Capitalino. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- La Caja de conversión. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, December, 1921.
- Calamdrelli, Alcides: El divorcio ante el derecho internacional privado. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Campos, Guillermo: Estudio sobre los recursos de la República de Honduras y su desarrollo comercial. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Carvalho, Elysio de: Lueta de centauros. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Castro, Víctor M. de.: El niño-heroe. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Catálogo de la Biblioteca de la Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País de Habana. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, November-December, 1921, and January-February, 1922.
- Centenario de la entrevista de Guayaquil (monumento conmemorativo). In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922 (reproduced from *La Prensa*, Buenos Aires, December 5, 1921).
- El Centenario de la independencia del Paraguay. In *Revista de la R. A. Hispanoamericana*, December, 1921.
- Chapman, Charles E.: Acercamiento cultural hacia las repúblicas suramericanas. In *La Nación* (Santiago de Chile), March 12, 1920.
- Breve informe sobre el intercambio de profesores con la Universidad de California. In *El Mercurio* (Santiago de Chile), October 20, 1920.
- The Chilean elections. In *The Nation*, October 20, 1920.

- Cortés and California. In *Grizzly Bear Magazine*, August, 1919.
- La Educación en Chile: ligeras observaciones de un profesor norteamericano. In *América* (Santiago de Chile), August 8, 1920.
- Mexico, the mother of California. In *California Southland*, October-December, 1919, and January, 1920.
- A Monroe doctrine divided. In *Political Science Quarterly*, March, 1922.
- The Name "California": its origin and application. In *Grizzly Bear Magazine*, December, 1919.
- The Northern mystery and the discovery of Alta California. In *id.*, February, 1921.
- La Política exterior de los Estados Unidos como demostración de su vida interna. In *El Mercurio* (Santiago de Chile), September 5, 1920.
- Sebastián Vizcaino: Exploration of California. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, April, 1920.
- South America: its lands, its peoples and its problems, Foreign Trade Lecture Course, lecture no. 43, Foreign Trade Club, San Francisco, 1919.
- Una Tierra romántica (California). In *América* (Santiago de Chile), September 21 and October 5, 1920.
- The Treasure galleons: being the romantic story of the first trans-Pacific line to Manila. In *Sunset*, February, 1921.
- Céspedes y Quesada, Carlos Manuel de: Manuel de Quesada y Loynaz (continued). In *Anales de la Academia de la Historia* (Habana), January-June, 1920.
- Chacón, Lucas Raúl: En los cerros de Candelaria. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, February, 1922.
- Chilean ethnological expeditions to Tierra del Fuego. In *The Geographical Review*, April, 1922.
- Clarke, Nell Ray: The haunts of the Caribbean corsairs. In *The National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1922.
- The cocoa industry of Ecuador. In *Bulletin of the Imperial Institute*, No. 3, 1921.
- Coester, Alfred: Amado Nervo. In *Hispania*, December, 1921.
- Colby, Elbridge: The United States and the Coto dispute between Panama and Costa Rica. In *The Journal of International Relations*, January, 1922.
- Coll y Toste, Cayetano: Carabalí (Leyenda Puertorriqueña. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, April, 1922.
- Colmo, Alfredo: Pan Americanism and Company. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. from *Nosotros*, Buenos Aires, June, 1921).
- El Primer rector de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. In *Revista de Filosofía*, January, 1922.
- Conangla Fontanilles, J.: Las Responsabilidades coloniales de España y el Ibero Americanismo. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, January-February, 1922.
- Pi y Margall y la independencia cubana. In *id.*, November-December, 1921.
- Connelley, William E.: Dr. Josiah Gregg, historian of the old Santa Fe trail. In *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Proceedings, November, 1921 (extra number).

- Correspondencia de don Antonio Varas con don Francisco Fuenzalida, sobre elecciones y revolución de 1851 en la provincia de Aconcagua. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, No. 43.
- The Covenant of the federation of Central America. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Revista de la Universidad*, Tegucigalpa, Honduras, February 15, 1921).
- Crampton, Ethel M.: The Judicial department in the Latin-American constitutions. In *Southwestern Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1921.
- The Legislative department in the Latin-American constitutions. In *id.*, September, 1921.
- Cravioto, Alfonso: Oración funebre pronunciada en representación de la Universidad Nacional [don Ramón López Velarde]. In *México Moderno*, November 1, 1920.
- Crónica. In *Anales de la Academia de la Historia* (Habana). January-June, 1920.
- Crónica de Méjico. In *Razón y Fe*, June, 1922.
- Cuadra Ch., Pedro J.: Unificación monetaria. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Cuervo, Luis Augusto: Lady Stanhope. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Cuervo, Rufino J. La lengua materna. In *Educación* (Managua), March-April, 1922.
- Curso de vacaciones para extranjeros en Madrid. In *Hispania*, November, 1921.
- Cushing, E. B.: Edward Hopkins Cushing. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, April, 1922.
- Datos históricos cubanos. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, July-August, September-October, November-December, 1921, and January-February, 1922.
- Dávalos y Lissón, Pedro: El Perú de la primera centuria republicana. In *Mercurio Peruano*, February, 1922.
- Dávila, Vicente: En el panteón nacional. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- Davis, W. M.: Lower California and its natural resources. In *The Geographical Review*, October, 1921.
- Davison, Diego T. R.: Desgaste de energía psíquica. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Dawley, Thomas R., Jr.: How the Central American union was born. In *Current History*, January, 1922.
- Dawson, Ralph: Porque está alto el dólar. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- A Defesa permanente do café. In *Annaes da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, August and December, 1921.
- Delgado, Jesús: Magallanes Descubridor o explorador solamente? In *España y América*, December, 1921.
- Deustua, Alejandro O.: La Estética de la libertad. In *Mercurio Peruano*, August, 1921, and February, 1922.
- Dillon, E. J.: Mexico revisited. In *Contemporary Review*, November, 1921.
- The Doctorate in Spain. In *Hispania*, December, 1921.
- Don Manuel Vicente Ballivián. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- D. Pedro II—Evocações. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.

- Dos dignos representantes del periodismo mexicano (José Gómez Ugarte and Gustavo A. Bravo, of *El Universal*). In *El Arte Tipográfico* (New York), September, 1921.
- Dos Santos, Alfredo G.: Bibliothecosophia. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.
- Dunn, William E.: Founding of Nuestra Señora del Refugio. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, January, 1922.
- Durland, William Davies: The forests of the Dominican Republic. In *The Geographical Review*, April, 1922.
- Edwards, Alberto: El ministerio Varas y la candidatura de don Manuel Montt. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Endara, Julio: Education in Ecuador: Philosophical custom during the colonial period. In *Inter-America* (transl. from *Revista del Centro de Estudiantes de Medicina*, Quito, March-June, 1920).
- La Escuela y el hogar. In *Educación* (Managua). March-April, 1922.
- Los Escritores argentinos juzgados en el extranjero. In *Nosotros* (Buenos Aires), February, 1922.
- Espinosa, Aurelio M.: On the teaching of Spanish. In *Hispania*, December, 1921.
- Viajes por España. III. La fuente del Ebro. IV. Castilla la Vieja. In *Id.*, October and November, 1921.
- El Exito. In *Educación* (Managua), November-December, 1921.
- Exposición de arte tipográfico hispano y americano en los Estados Unidos. In *El Arte Tipográfico* (New York), October, 1921.
- The Extinguishment of yellow fever in Guayaquil. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Fray Mocha*, Buenos Aires, May 10, 1921).
- Fairchild, David: The jungles of Panama. In *The National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1922.
- La Federación de Centro América. In *Revista de la R.A. Hispanoamericana*, December, 1921.
- Federación de Colegios de Abogados. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Fernandoiz, José Luis: El conflicto eclesiástico de Tacna. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Fernandes, A.: A Fundação Oliveira Lima em Washington. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Fernández Guardia, Ricardo: A Central American Joan of Arc. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Crónicas Coloniales*, San José, Costa Rica, 1921).
- Fragmentos de *La Historia de Centro América*, por Robert Glasgow Dunlop, (transl. from English). In *Revista de Costa Rica*, November, 1921, and December and January, 1922.
- La Jura de D. Luis I. In *id.*, December, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Fernández Mac-Grégor, Genaro: Estudio sobre la procedencia del amparo. In *Revista Mexicana de Derecho Internacional*, September, 1921.
- Fernández Peralta, Rafael: Un volcán olvidado. In *id.*, December, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Fernández Peralta, Rafael, and Rafael M. Tristán: Temblores registrados en el observatorio nacional durante el año 1920. In *id.*, November, 1921.

- Fidel Tristán, J.: La familia real de Talamanca. In *id.*, February, 1922.
- La Fiesta de la raza. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1921, nos. 48-49.
- Bibliografía de Enrique Pineyro. Con una introducción notas y un complemento por Domingo Figarola-Caneda (concluded). In *Anales de la Academia de la Historia*, January-June, 1920.
- Fermín, Anténor: Haiti and the confederation of the Antilles. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. from *Las Antillas*, Habana, May, 1921).
- Fitz-Gerald, John D.: The bilingual-biracial problem of our border states. In *Hispania*, October, 1921.
- Fortoul, Gil: Literatura Latino-Americana. In *Cultura Venezolana*, December, 1921.
- Gagini, Carlos: Cuentos Bribris. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, February, 1922.
- Gaither, R. B.: The Interpretation of the confiscatory phases of the Mexican constitution of 1917. In *American Law Review*, January-February, 1922.
- The Labor laws of Mexico. In *Virginia Law Review*, February, 1922.
- The Mexican constitution of 1917—confiscatory phases. In *American Law Review*, July-August, 1921.
- Gálvez, Manuel: Emilio Pardo Bazán. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Nosotros*, Buenos Aires, May, 1921).
- García Calderón, Francisco: Simón Bolívar. In *id.* (transl. from *Reproducción*, San José, Costa Rica, July 30, 1921).
- García Calderón, Ventura: José Asunción Silva. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- García Godoy, Federico: Bustos dominicanos. José Núñez de Cáceres. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, Habana, April, 1922.
- García Salazar, Arturo: Antecedentes de la guerra de 1879. In *Mercurio Peruano*, February, 1922.
- Gárdén, John: Libertad y libertinaje. In *Educación* (Managua), January-February, 1922.
- Garzón Eugenio: Discurriendo alrededor de voluptuosidad de Miguel Angel Corral. Filosofía del estilo. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, April, 1922.
- Gassler, Rt. Rev. F. L.: Père Anthoine, supreme officer of the Holy Inquisition of Cartagena in Louisiana. In *The Catholic Historical Review*, April, 1922.
- Gay Calbó, Enrique: Escritores juvenes de Cuba. Ramón S. Varona. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, December, 1921.
- La Intromisión norteamericana en Centro-América. In *Nosotros*, April and May, 1922.
- G. B.: Museu historico brasileira. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Godoy, Juvenal M. de: Industrias agricolas. In *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, April, 1922.
- González, Eloy G.: Caracas en el siglo XIX. In *Hispanoamérica* (Caracas), January, 1922.
- González, Julio V.: La Revolución universitaria de Córdoba en 1918. In *Revista de Filosofia* (Buenos Aires), January, 1922.
- González Calderón, Juan A.: La ley de alquileres. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- González Roura, Octavio: Las transformaciones del derecho penal contemporánea, In *id.*

- The Great Brazilian International Exposition. In *Pan American Review*, December, 1921.
- Gruening, Ernest H.: Conquest of Haiti and Santo Domingo. In *Current History*, March, 1922.
- Haiti and Santo Domingo today. In *Nation*, February 15, 1922.
- Haiti under American occupation. In *Century*, April, 1922.
- The Senators visit Haiti and Santo Domingo. In *Nation*, January 4, 1922.
- Guerra, Ramiro: The present state of primary education in Cuba. In *Inter-America*. February, 1922 (transl. from *Cuba Contemporanea*, October, 1921).
- Gutiérrez, Juan María: La poesía americana. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Hackett, Charles W.: The new regime in Mexico. In *Southwestern Political Science Quarterly*, June, 1921.
- Harrison, Randolph: The Monroe Doctrine, its origin, meaning and application. In *American Law Review*, May-June, 1921.
- Hatcher, Mattie Austin: Conditions in Texas affecting the colonization problem, 1795-1801. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, October, 1921.
- Henríquez y Carvajal, Federico: Cartas [sobre la actual situación en Santo Domingo]. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, May, 1922.
- Henríquez Ureña, Max: Optimism, idealism, patriotism. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921.
- Henríquez Ureña, Pedro: Miniaturas mexicanas. In *Nosotros*, April, 1922.
- Rubén Darío y el siglo XV. In *Revue Hispanique*, December, 1920.
- Hoffman, Frederick L.: American business opportunities in Bolivia. In *The Economic World* (New York), October 15, 1921.
- Homenaje a Javier Prado. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- Las ideas políticas de Chocano. In *id.*, January, 1922.
- Ingenieros, José: Agustín Álvarez. In *Inter-America*, June, 1922 (transl. from *América*, Buenos Aires, October and November, 1921).
- Simpatía, justicia, solidaridad. In *Revista de Filosofía* (Buenos Aires), January, 1922.
- Inman, Samuel G.: Organized labor in South America. In *Current History*, May, 1922.
- James, H. G.: New constitution of Peru. In *Southwestern Political Science Quarterly*, June, 1921.
- Jones, Maro Beath: The revised Portuguese orthography. In *Hispania*, October, 1921.
- José Joaquín Olmedo (1780-1847). In *Educación* (Managua), November-December, 1921.
- Journal of Lewis Birdsall Harris. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, October, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Laet, Carlos de: Pedro II. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Lagorio, Arturo: Argentine painters. In *Inter-America*, February, 1922 (transl. from *Nosotros*, August 21, 1921).
- La Mota, Arturo de: Apuntes sobre la crítica literaria en la Argentina. In *Nosotros*, April, 1922.

- Lapradille, A. de, and N. Politis: L'indivisibilité de la frontière, et la conflit colombo-venezelien. In *Revue Gén. de Droit Inter. Pub.*, January-April, 1921.
- Latin-American union. In *Inter-America*, February, 1922 (transl. from editorial in *Comercio*, Medellín, Colombia), October, 1921).
- Latorre, Germán: Del trato que tuvieron los Indios por el libro VI de las Leyes de Indias. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1922, nos. 52-53.
- Los españoles y Portugueses. In *id.*, 1921, nos. 50-51.
- Sobre el proyecto de federación de las entidades americanistas españoles. In *id.*, 1921, nos. 46-47.
- Lavalle, Juan B. de: Prado: el jurista; el abogado. In *Mercurio Peruano*. September-December, 1921.
- Le Brun, J.: La cruz del peregrino. In *Educación* (Managua), March-April, 1922.
- Levene, Ricardo: The beginnings of the University of Buenos Aires. In *Inter-America*, June, 1922 (transl. from *Revista Jurídica y de Ciencias Sociales*, Buenos Aires, August-September, 1921).
- Ley modificanda el código de procedimientos en lo criminal de la capital. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Libro de las longitudes . . . por Alonso de Santa Cruz. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1921, nos. 46-47, 48-49, 50-51.
- Lindrgren, Waldemar: A recent deposit of a thermal spring in Bolivia. In *Economic Geology*, May, 1922.
- Lloyd, David: Exposición de arte tipográfico hispanoamericano. In *Inter-America*, November, 1920 (transl. into Spanish from *The Evening Post*, New York, July 30, 1921).
- López Portillo y Rojas, José: La independencia de México y el derecho internacional. In *Revista Mexicana de Derecho Internacional*, September, 1921.
- Lozano T., Fabio: Javier Prado y Ugarteche. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- Machado, Luis: La isla de Pinos, de hecho y derecho, es territorio cubano. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, April, 1922.
- Maldonada, S. J.: Bolívar en Ocumare. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- Marceli, J. C.: Algo de la historia natural del istmo de Panamá. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Marcó, Sebastián L.: Educación moral. ¿Que se ha logrado en un siglo? In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Marín A., Julio: Las matemáticas. In *Educación* (Managua), November-December, 1921.
- Marín Vicuña, Santiago: La minería en Chile y Perú. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Marino Pérez, Luis: Las relaciones económicas entre Cuba y los Estados Unidos. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, April, 1922.
- Martin, Percy F.: Brazil and its finances. In *The Financial Review of Reviews* (London), June, 1922.
- Is Mexico solvent? In *id.*, March, 1922.
- Martín M., Javier: 20 de agosto de 1820. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.

- Martínez Zuviría, Gustavo: El dólar contra el peso. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, December, 1921.
- Mather, Kirtley E.: Exploration in the land of the Yuracares, eastern Bolivia. In *The Geographical Review*, January, 1922.
- Mathieu, Beltrán: The Spanish language and literature. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922.
- Means, Philip Ainsworth: Breves apuntes sobre la sociología campestre del Perú. In *Mercurio Peruano*, August, 1921.
- Mello Leitao, Dr.: As aranhas. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.
- Memorial to James Orton on Lake Titicaca. In *The Geographical Review*, January, 1922.
- Méndez, Joaquín: El Quetzal. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Mínima, C.: La cosmogonía por choque. In *Educación* (Managua), March-April, 1922.
- Mitré, Bartolome: San Martín. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *La Prensa*, Lima, July 28, 1921, supplement).
- Molina, Miguel V.: Nuestra vida pública y el carácter individual. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Monner Sans, R.: Cazuelas y miriñaques. In *id.*
- Monte, Domingo del: Centón epistolario de Domingo del Monte. Con un prefacio y anotaciones por Domingo Figarola-Caneda (concluded). In *Anales de la Academia de la Historia*, January-June, 1920.
- Montoro, Arturo: La enseñanza secundaria en Cuba. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, December, 1921.
- Montoto, Santiago: Martínez Montañés en el Archivo de Indias. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1921, nos. 48-49.
- : Permisión de 500 toneladas al escultor Juan Martínez Montañés. In *id.*
- Montt, Luis: Bibliografía chilena. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Mora Guarnido, José: Los españoles en la Argentina. In *Nuestro Tiempo* (Madrid), March, 1922.
- Moraes Barros, Paulo de: Matto Grosso. In *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, April and May, 1922.
- Morales, Pedro J.: General Don Tomás Masís. In *Educación* (Managua), November-December, 1921.
- Morales de la Torre, P.: Prado, evocador de la castiza tradición limeña. In *Mercurio Peruano*, September-December, 1921.
- Moreno Gómez, José: La política en Colombia. In *España y América*, February, 1922.
- Morley, Sylvanus: The foremost intellectual achievements of ancient America. In *The National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1922.
- Morrow, James B.: Keeping the Americas together. In *Nation's Business*, February, 1922.
- Movimiento económico de la República. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, March, 1922.
- Muckleroy, Anna: The Indian policy of the Republic of Texas. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, April, 1922.

- Navarro Tomás, T.: Lecciones de pronunciación española, IV. In *Hispania*, October, 1921.
- Navas, J. M.: La laguna misteriosa. (Leyendas ometepinas). In *Educación* (Managua), January-February, 1922.
- Navas, Manuel R.: Crónica Americanista. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1921, nos. 50-51.
- Nervo, Amado: Liberty. In *Inter-America*, February, 1922 (transl. from *Reproducción*, San José, Costa Rica, October 25, 1921).
- Neuhauss Ugarteche, Carlos: Bartolome Mitre ante las democracias americanas. In *Mercurio Peruano*, August, 1921.
- Newton Arthur Percival: Christopher Columbus and his great enterprise. In *History* (London), April, 1922.
- Nortz, Eugenio: O commercio mundial do café. In *Annaes da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, September, 1921.
- Nuestras deficiencias en el ramo de instrucción pública. In *Educación* (Managua), January-February, 1922.
- La Nueva constitución de Santa Fe. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Obrigón desarma a Harding. In *Revista de la R.A. Hispanoamericana*, December, 1921.
- O'Hara, John F. C. S. C.: The league of Catholic women in Uruguay. In *The Catholic World*, May, 1921.
- Olmedilla, Joaquín: The history of cotton. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. from *Revista de la Enseñanza*, San Salvador, March, 1921).
- Ortiz, Fernando: Un Catauro de Cubanismos.—(Mamotreto de "Cubicherías" lexicográficos. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, July-August, September-October, November-December, 1921, and January-February, 1922.
- El Vocablo "Canuco". In *Cuba Contemporánea*, November, 1921.
- Palma, Ricardo: Peruvian traditions. I. The first steamboat. II. The "Achirana" of the Inca. III. The two millions. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *Tradiciones Peruanas*, Barcelona, 1894).
- Para llegar a ser rentista. In *Educación* (Managua), January-February, 1922.
- París Lozano: Letras americanas. Antonio Gómez Restrepo. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, March, 1922.
- Pasemore, R. McCartney: Informe sobre la isla del Coco. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, November, 1921.
- Pereyra, Carlos: Rosas y Thiers. In *Nosotros*, April, 1922.
- Pérez Porta, Félix: La doctrina de Monroe. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922.
- The Monroe Doctrine. In *Inter-América*, June, 1922 (transl. from *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922).
- Pérez i Soto, Juan B.: Bolívar y San Martín. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- Perkins, Dexter: Europe, Spanish America, and the Monroe Doctrine. In *American Historical Review*, January, 1922.
- Pernambuco, Mario: O saneamento rural. In *Annaes da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, January-February, 1922.

- Personalidades sociales.—Los Escalada. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922. (Reproduced from *La Prensa*, Buenos Aires, September 16, 1916).
- Pessoa, P.: O exercito novo. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Pinto Serva, Mario: A igreja Catholica e a educação. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.
- Pittier, Henri F.: Costa Rica, su orografía e hidrografía. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, December, 1921, and January and February, 1922.
- Planas Suárez, S.: De la condition juridique des étrangers au Venezuela. In *Jour. Droit. Inter.*, January–April, 1921.
- Poblete A., M. J.: El II tomo de la historia militar de la guerra del Pacífico, por el coronel don Guillermo Ekdahl. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Poblete M., Rafael: El servicio sanitario en el ejército de Chile durante la guerra del Pacífico, 1879–1884. In *id.*
- Ponce, Aníbal N.: Los problemas de la herencia psicológica. In *Revista de Filosofía* (Buenos Aires), January, 1922.
- Popenoe, Paul B.: Costa Rica, the land of the banana. In *The National Geographic Magazine*, February, 1922.
- Porrás Troconis, Gabriel: The dememberment of Greater Colombia. In *Inter-America*, October, 1921 (transl. from *Cultura Venezolana*, November, 1920).
- Posnansky, Arthur: El gran templo del sol en los Andes (la edad de Tihuanacu; astronomía prehistórica). In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Post, Regis H.: What's wrong with Porto Rico? In *World's Work*, January, 1922.
- Prado, Eladio: Reliquias existentes en la iglesia de Orosi. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, February, 1922.
- Price, G. V.: Panama Canal and recent world politics. In *The Historical Outlook*, November, 1921.
- Priestley, Herbert Ingram: Mexican agrarianism. In *North American Review*, February, 1922.
- Procedimientos industriales. In *Educación*, January–February, 1922.
- Quiróga, Abértana: La reforma constitucional de Santa Fe. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, September, 1921.
- Quiroga, Pedro de: Libro intitulado Coloquios de la Verdad. Trata de las causas e inconvenientes que impiden la doctrina e conversión de los Indios de los reinos del Pirú y de los daños e males, e agravios que padecen. Compuesto por . . . sacerdote que residió en aquellos reinos. 1st instalment. Edited from the original MS. in the Escorial, by P. Fr. Julián Zarco Cuevos, O.S.A. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1922, nos. 52–53.
- Ramm-Domán, R. A.: Política comercial y económica en el mundo después de la guerra. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, January, 1922.
- Ramos, José Antonio: Sentido económico de la emancipación de la mujer. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922.
- Ramos Sucre, José Antonio: Hace un siglo. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Reading the stone books of the Nahua Indians, pictographers of Mexico. In *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 12, 1922.
- Reed, Mary: Politics and Porto Rico. In *Nation*, February 1, 1922.

- The Republic of Chile. In *Weekly Export Bulletin*, June 17, 1922.
- Retana, W. E.: Diccionario de Filipinismos con la versión de lo que al respecto lleva publicado la Real Academia Española. In *Revue Hispanique* (Paris), February, 1921.
- El Marquesado de Villamediana. In *Nuestro Tiempo* (Madrid), April, 1922.
- Rio, João do: El sueño de la Atlántida. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Rippy, J. Fred: Literary Yankeeophobia in Hispanic America. In *The Journal of International Relations*, January, 1922.
- Rivas Vicuña, Francisco: Las guerras de Bolívar. In *Cultura Venezolana*, August, 1921.
- *Id.* In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Rivera Schreiber, Ricardo: La Liga de las Naciones en la historia. In *Mercurio Peruano*, August, 1921.
- Roca Dordal, Francisco: Educação physica. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.
- Rodó, José Enrique: De la tradición de los pueblos hispano-americanos. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Rodríguez, José Angel: Fray Bartolomé de las Casas. In *Educación* (Managua), March-April, 1922.
- Patria, juventud e ideal. In *id.*, November-December, 1921.
- Rodríguez Embil, Luis: Sobre un libro de guerra y la psicología del combatiente. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, November, 1921.
- Rodríguez Lendián, Evelio: Elogio del doctor Ramón Meza y Suárez Inclán, académico de número (concluded). In *Anales de la Academia de la Historia* (Habana), January-June, 1920.
- Rodríguez-Navas, Manuel: Crónica americanista. In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1922, nos. 52-53.
- Rojas, Ricardo: Bartolomé Mitre: his intellectual personality. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. from *La Nación*, Buenos Aires, June 26, 1921 and February, 1922).
- Román, Eric: Los vestigios de industria humana encontrados en Miramar (República Argentina) y atribuidos a la época terciaria. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921 no. 43.
- Rousset, Ricardo V.: Cristóbal Colón y el descubrimiento del nuevo mundo. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, July-August, and September-October, 1921.
- Rowe, L. S.: The development of democracy on the American continent. In *The American Political Science Review*, February, 1922.
- Rufino, José Cuervo (1844-1911). In *Educación* (Managua), March-April, 1922.
- Saenz de Tejada, Federico: American international Law: may one state exact of another, *manu militari*, the payment of debts contracted in its behalf or that of its citizens? In *Inter-America*, February, 1922 (transl. from *Centro-América* (Guatemala), April-September, 1921).
- ¿ Puedo un estado exigir de otro "Manu militari" el pago de deudas contraídas en favor suyo o de sus ciudadanos? In *Revista Mexicana de Derecho Internacional*, September, 1921.
- Safford, William Edwin: Xochinacaztli, flor sagrada de los aztecas. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.

- Salas, Julio C.: El parasitismo social en nuestra América. In *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, September-October, 1921.
- Salaverri, Vicente, A.: Juana de Ibarbournu. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. from *Revista de Revistas*, México, April 11, 1921).
- Sánchez, Manuel S.: Una leyenda bibliográfica (el compendio, resumen o recuerdos de la Historia de Venezuela por don Andrés Bello). In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Miranda as a philosopher and scholar. In *Inter-America*, October, 1922 (transl. from *Revista de Filosofía*, Buenos Aires, August, 1921).
- Santa Cruz, Joaquín: Los indígenas del Ecuador. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Santo Chocano, José: Tres notas de nuestra alma indígena. In *Mercurio Peruano*, February, 1922.
- Sarmiento Laspair, E.: Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, y el nuevo sistema de derecho internacional. In *Revista de Filosofía*, January, 1922.
- Schapiro, Louis: La inspección médica en las eselas públicas de Centro América. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Schuster, Edward: The Texas Company's amparo case. In *American Bar Association Journal*, November, 1921.
- Scott, James Brown: The treaty between Colombia and the United States. In *American Journal of International Law*, July, 1921.
- Selva, Rogerio de la: Con motivo del prebitero Dr. Simeón Cañas. In *Educación*, January-February, 1922.
- Seguí, Francisco: La cuestión ferroviaria. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Semprum, Jesús: Carta del norte. In *Cultura Venezolana*, July, 1921.
- Silva Vildósola, Carlos; Montaner Bello, Ricardo; and Austria, José: Homenaje a Bolívar. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Serre del Sagues, Paul: Entierros indígenas en Costa Rica. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, November, 1921.
- Silgueira, J. Honorio: La legislación procesal en Corrientes. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Silveira Santos, Joaquim da: Tuadentes, hero and saint. In *Inter-America*, February, 1922 (transl. from *Revista do Brasil*, São Paulo, June, 1921).
- Silvestre, Tomás P.: Belgrano. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Sors, Fray Antonio: Historia del reino de Chile situado en la América Meridional (continued). In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- South American population. In *Pan American Review*, December, 1921.
- Souza Reis, F. T. de: O problema das carnes. In *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, April, 1922.
- Subercasseaux, Guillermo: La evolución contemporánea de la política económica de las repúblicas americanas hacia el nacionalismo proteccionista. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, January, 1922.
- Taunay, Affonso d'E.: Transformação de cenário de 7 de Setembro. In *Revista Nacional* (São Paulo), October, 1921.

- Tejera, Diego Vicente: La indolencia cubana. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, March, 1922.
- Un sistema socialista práctico. In *id.*, November, 1921.
- Tello, Julio: Prehistoric Peru. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *Introducción a la Historia Antigua del Perú*, Lima, November, 1921).
- The term Latin-America repudiated by the second Spanish-American Congress of History and Geography. In *Hispania*, October, 1921.
- Teuma, Emilio: Fermín Váldez Domínguez. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, May, 1922.
- Thayer Ojeda, Tomás: Un ejemplo de cómo se iba o se venía de España en el siglo XVI, y contratiempos e imprevistos que solían ocurrir. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, no. 43.
- Reseña histórico-biográfica de los eclesiásticos en el descubrimiento y conquista de Chile (continued). In *id.*
- Torres Lanzas, Pedro: Catálogo de legajos del Archivo General de Indias (continued). In *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* (Seville), 1921, nos. 46-47, 48-49, and 50-51, and 1922, nos. 52-53.
- Escudos de armas, etc. In *id.*, 1922, nos. 52-53.
- Torres Ríoseco, Arturo: Literatura Sudamericana. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, November, 1921.
- Torres Rivera, Enrique: Literatura portorriqueña. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Traversari, Pedro Pablo: La arqueología americana en la civilización moderna. In *id.*
- Triunfos y honores obtenidos por escritores cubanos. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, January, 1922.
- Ugarte, César A.: La actualidad internacional. In *Mercurio Peruano*, January, 1922.
- Ugarte, Manuel: El porvenir de la América Española. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Umphrey, George W.: José Santos Chocano y Walt Whitman. In *Mercurio Peruano*, February, 1922.
- La Solidaridad panamericana. In *Inter-America*, December, 1921 (transl. into Spanish from *The Pacific Review of Seattle*, June, 1921).
- Valle, Alfonso: Nicarahuismos y Antillanismos. In *Educación* (Managua), November-December, 1921.
- Valle, Francisco G. del: Páginas para la historia de Cuba. Documentos. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, December, 1921-May, 1922 (continued).
- Valle, Rafael Heliodoro: El naturalista Mociño. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, December, 1921, and January, 1922.
- Varona, Enrique José: Una carta y su comentario [sobre Cuba]. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, May, 1922.
- Vasconcelos, José: Nueva ley de los tres estados. In *Revista Mexicana de Derecho Internacional*, September, 1921.
- Vasquez, João Baptista: Estrada de Ferro Norte de Matto Grosso. In *Revista da Sociedade Rural Brasileira*, March, 1922.
- Vásquez, José V.: Alma y cerebro. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Vegas, Manuel I.: Cristóbal Colón. In *Mercurio Peruano*, August, 1921, and February, 1922.

- A Vegetation map of Venezuela. In *The Geographical Review*, April, 1922.
- Velasco y Arias, Maria: La transformación del romance en la Argentina. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Vélez Sarsfield, Dalmacio: Nulidades absolutas y relativas. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Viana, Victor: Chronica economica e financeira. In *Ilustração Brasileira*, December, 1920.
- Vicuña Mackenna, Carlos: Discurso pronunciado en representación de la Sociedad Chilena de Historia y Geografía en el ateneo de Santiago. In *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 3d quarter, 1921, No. 43.
- Videla, Ricardo: La cuestión agraria argentina. In *Revista de Economía Argentina*, March, 1922.
- Villafañe, Emilio A.: En el día del árbol (discurso pronunciado en Jujuy). In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.
- Villalba Muñoz, Alberto: The tonal system of Inca music. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *Música de América*, Buenos Aires, July, 1921).
- Villegas, Rafael: El Dr. Don Jose Maria Castro. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, February, 1922.
- Vivanco, Carlos A.: The Ecuadorean campaign: 1821-1822. In *Inter-America*, April and June, 1922 (transl. from *Buletín de la Biblioteca Nacional del Ecuador*, Quito, November-December, 1920).
- Webb, W. P.: The last treaty of the Republic of Texas. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, January, 1922.
- Werkle, Carlos: La subregión fitogeográfica costarricense. In *Revista de Costa Rica*, November, 1921.
- Whitbeck, R. H.: Geographical relations in the development of Cuban agriculture. In *The Geographical Review*, April, 1922.
- Williams, Mary W.: The new Central America. In *North American Review*, September, 1921.
- Wilmart, R.: Revelación del credo impuesto por el partido llamado radical (continued). In *Revista Argentina de Ciencia Política*, November, 1921.
- Winkelried, Bertoni, G. de: El tambu y la muerte de los Tacuaras. In *Hispanoamérica*, January, 1922.
- Winkler, E. W. ed.: The Bryan-Hayes correspondence. In *Southwestern Historical Quarterly Review*, October, 1921, and January and April, 1922.
- Winston, James E.: The annexation of Texas and the Mississippi democrats. In *id.*, July, 1921.
- Yrigoyen, Pedro: El Cumplimiento del tratado de Ancón y la invitación de Chile para realizar el plebiscito. In *Mercurio Peruano*, January, 1922.
- Javier Prado: su labor internacional. In *id.*, September-December, 1921.
- Zarranz Sánchez, José de J.: La pena de muerte. In *Cuba Contemporánea*, April, 1922.
- Zavalía, Clodomiro: Unificación de fueros. In *Revista del Colegio de Abogados de Buenos Aires*, January, 1922.
- Zeballos, Estanislao S.: Año nuevo. Síntesis de historia argentina. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.

- The Conference on the limitation of armaments. In *Inter-America*, April, 1922 (transl. from *La Prensa*, Buenos Aires, December 18, 1921).
- La Diplomatie des Etats-Unis dans l'Amérique du Sud. In *Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, September, 1920.
- La Elección de Buenos Aires. In *Revista de Derecho, Historia y Letras*, January, 1922.

